THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
1800

Picture of the Taj Mahal

# MARRIAGE AND EFFICIENCY

BY

CARL RAMUS, M.D.

MEMBER ASSOCIATION OF MILITARY SURGEONS, U. S.
MEMBER AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION
FORMERLY AMERICAN DELEGATE OFFICE INTERNATIONALE D'HYGIÈNE PUBLIQUE, PARIS
MEMBER ASTRONOMICAL SOCIETY OF THE PACIFIC

G. P. PUTNAM'S SONS
NEW YORK AND LONDON
The Knickerbocker Press
1922

HQ729
.R3

Copyright, 1922
by
Carl Ramus

Made in the United States of America

The Knickerbocker Press
New York

JUL 18 1922

Price $2.00 net

©Cl.A677561

DEDICATED TO

DOCTOR MARIE CARMICHAEL STOPES

OF LONDON

# AUTHOR'S NOTE

THE several Chapters of the book were written from memoranda at different times during many years, as opportunity and various duties permitted. Therefore the book as a whole lacks the continuity of one written according to a fixed outline. Time does not allow regrouping and rewriting of the material. Rather than delay its publication indefinitely, it is offered in its present form.

# INTRODUCTION

THE pursuit of happiness is Man's strongest natural urge. It is dignified in the American Declaration of Independence as one of the inalienable rights endowed by the Creator. Oriental philosophy in its ancient wisdom has long claimed that happiness expands the consciousness, and defines it as "moreness of the Self." And now in our own day Western science has discovered that happiness, health, and efficiency are directly related, and in a measure interdependent; thus linking up with the older axiom, "The purpose of philosophy is the end of pain."

Bards and poets of all ages have lauded marriage as the Temple of Happiness, and all who have entered marriage have done so mainly in the pursuit of happiness. Many who have found therein bitter disappointment believe that married felicity is a phantom whose only purpose is race perpetuation. But still for the vast majority marriage holds its ancient place in minds and hearts as the most beneficent giver of happiness and heart rest.

Many books tell of marriage and its problems. But all that I have read, with one splendid exception, lack the feature absolutely necessary to make them really and practically helpful, and without which all the rest counts for little—*frankness.* That lack I have tried to supply in this book. It may be thought by some that in my frankness I have reached toc primary a level of crude simplicity in dealing with the subjects of personal mannerisms and habits; it may be thought that the cultivated intellectual person stands in no need of instruction on these points to the extent to which I have gone.

Professional and social observation force me to take the opposite view, and have awakened me to the startling latitude which many persons of real refinement unconsciously allow themselves in this same field of personal habits. And yet a very little honest self-examination will convince anyone how easy it is to drift into sins of omission and carelessness until they become habits, and habits that make one less lovable and less attractive. Therefore I have deliberately painted these dangers in strong colors, being convinced from personal observation that too much stress can hardly be laid on them in this connection.

Physicians, more than any others, necessarily have opportunities to see and know people as they *are*, in happiness or sorrow, in the midst of their problems and their ignorance, divested of shams and camouflage. Hence the true physician stands in the place of a confessor, for with his wider knowledge of life, and of causes and effects, he, more than any priest, has the great privilege of leading people out of the sins and sorrows of ignorance into the happiness of right knowledge.

This book is not addressed to physicians and scientists but to the educated and cultured laity. It tells people the practical and essential things that physicians seldom tell; not that physicians desire to withhold helpful information, but because hardly one in ten considers the question from any but the materialistic side.

In the final summing up, the things really worth while are the heart ties. Intellect and its achievements are sterile, except as they minister to Love in its widest aspect as Service. Furthermore, Intellect can never do its best work until liberated from emotional stress, until the heart is at rest.

Love has nothing to fear from Truth, but selfishness has everything to fear. Selfishness and ignorance are the twin deadly enemies of Love, thriving in secrecy and darkness, but disintegrating in the light of Truth. It can be confidently said to many, if not yet to all, whose lives are darkened by married unhappiness, "The Truth shall make you free."

# CONTENTS

## CHAPTER I

IDEALS AND CONDITIONS . . . . 3

The Dream of Union—Disillusionments—Alternatives—Pessimistic Explanation—Intuitive Convictions—Love Superlative—Ignorance and Inharmony—Social Lessons—Strains on Friendships—Relativity of Friendship—Friendship and Sex—Bulwarks of Society—Dangerous Tendencies—The Problem, Old and New—Happiness and Public Health—Heart Hunger—The Question of Satisfaction—Camouflage or Facts—Bernard Shaw's Alternative—General Causes of Married Unhappiness—Ignorance—Selfishness—Carelessness—Lack of Frankness—Economic Stress—Unhappiness Mostly Preventable.

## CHAPTER II

PERMANENT INCOMPATIBILITIES . . . 16

Normal Physical Basis Essential—Beauty and Love—Quixotic Sentiments—Eugenic Crimes—"All Defectives are Bad"—Age—Health—Habits—Snoring—Religion—Temperament—Selfishness—Caste—Interests—Economic Stress.

## CHAPTER III

THE SEXUAL CYCLE . . . . . 26

Important Rediscovery—Essential in Sex Education—Menstruation—Ebb and Flow of Sexual Tide—Rhythmic Alternations—Exceptions—"Psychological Moments"—"Love at First Sight"—Materialistic Theory—Other Hypotheses—Glamour of the Moment—Perception of the Beautiful—Sick Bed Romances—Inept Conclusions—Average Marriages Motivated Solely by Sex—Why Not?—Where Discrimination Needed—Reciprocity—Birth Control.

CHAPTER IV

PERSONAL HYGIENE . . . . . 41

"Old Wives for New"—Personal Carelessness Frequent—Professional Observations—Delicacy and Sensitiveness—Effects of Odors—Perfumes—Emanations—Mutual Care before Marriage—Mutual Negligence after Marriage—Vital Importance of Daily Bath—Offensive Breath and its Causes and Remedies—Care of the Feet—Their Frequent Negligence—Prevention and Cure of Sweating and Smelling of Feet—Excessive Perspiration and Remedies—Hygiene of Menstruation—Carelessness of Many Women—Separate Beds—Example from Balzac—Disgust from Vile Personal Odors—Psychic Shock and Sexual Coldness—"Cleanliness is Next to Godliness."

CHAPTER V

CHRONIC IRRITATION . . . . . 61

Offenses to the Sight—Neglect in Dress—Modesty and Nudity—Small Irritations—Artificial Standards—Early Training—Practical Importance of Non-Essentials—Individual Conceptions of Manners and Vulgarity—Pipe Smoking at Home—Indifference to Comfort of Others—Inopportune Requests—Pipe Smoking as a Result of Chronic Irritation—Anæsthetic Effects of Alcohol and Tobacco—Bad Temper and Nagging—Be a Sport or Quit—Fresh Air Fiends and Otherwise—

Live and Let Live—Give and Take—Cultivate Adaptability.

CHAPTER VI

FATIGUE . . . . . . . 73

Universal Property of Matter—Fatigue and Pain—Nature's Warnings—Law of Alternation—Action and Repose—Uninterrupted Pleasure may Become Pain—Bodies and Sense Organs Tire—Beauty Itself Remains—Need for Periods of Solitude—Experience Built into Character—Effects of Great Experiences—Meditation—Emotional Stagnation—Physical Analogies—Reactions of Electrified Bodies—Human Analogies—Child and Parents—Magnetism and Demagnetization—The Kiss of Welcome—Polarization—Sympathetic Vibration—Response and Thrill—Fatigue or Excitement—Laws of Human Attraction and Repulsion.

CHAPTER VII

CONVENTIONAL BOGIES . . . . 82

Double Beds—Obsolete Custom—Modern People more Highly Strung—Continuous Intimacy and Nerve Strain—Frankness Lacking—Enduring each other when Tired—Mutual Demagnetization—Siamese Twin Ideal—Typical Examples—Family Fixations—Herd Instinct—Oriental and Continental Customs—Tiresome Relatives in Home—The Mother-in-law—Home Should be First—False Pride—Shyness—Sensitiveness—Misunderstandings—Polarization — Heart Isolation—Reunion.

CHAPTER VIII

JEALOUSY AND TEARS . . . . . . 93

Frequency of Jealousy—Doubt—Fear—Humiliation—Anger—Resentment—Hatred—Revenge—Desire to

Hold—To Get Rather than to Give—Vanity—Self-love—Jealousy, Wounded Vanity and Wounded Self-love—Jealousy Irritating—Criticism and Protest—Demands, Rights and Inspiration—Touchiness and Inferiority—Jealousy the Negation of Love—Tears—Heroines of Old-fashioned Novels—Poetic Misconceptions—Beauty and Tears—The Facts—Tears and Lack of Self-control—Personal Carelessness—Bad Temper—Complete Polarization—Mutual Disgust—Conventional Jealousy—Knowledge the Remedy—Law Suits for Alienation of Affections.

CHAPTER IX

Variety of Interests . . . . . 105

Work in Common—Mutual Interests—Separation and Reunion—Basis of Real Friendships—Several Mutual Interests—The Sex Element—Romance and Poetry of Life—Variety the Spice—Man's Kaleidoscopic Ideal of Woman—Variety in Moods—Variety in Capacities—Ordinary Friendships—Many-sided Personalities—Sharing of Interests—Friendships in Marriage—Alternation of Interests—Use and Abuse—Laws of Attraction not Altered by Marriage—The Cycle of Friendship—The Cycle of Mutual Interest—Intimacy and Separation—Deductions from Marriage, Courtship, and Illicit Love—Factors in Disillusionment—Continuous Intimacy—Conventions and Necessity—Romance can be Conserved.

CHAPTER X

Love and Beauty . . . . . . 114

Oriental Psychology—The Emotion of Beauty—Love and Beauty—Beauty and Attraction—Individual Concept of Beauty—A Working Definition—Beauty and Inspiration—Beauty and Sex—The Mutual Response—

The Effect on Conduct—Beauty as a Divine Thing—Essential Considerations in Married Happiness—Transference to Child—Absolute Need for Co-operation in Work or Service—The Individual Ideal of Beauty—If Definite it should be Sought for—Fate or Chance—Fetiches—Ideals of Beauty of Special Parts of Body—Examples—Importance for Durable Love—Physical Ideals and Inner Needs—Complements—Affinities—Sense of Duty—Where Wrong Comes in—One Continuing to Love; the Other Ceasing to Love—Conditions Responsible—Inspiration Lost—Fatigue—Psychic Shock—Transference—Quality of the Love—Indifference and Effort—Polarization—Unselfishness—Preconceived False Ideals of Love—Knowledge of Laws.

CHAPTER XI

RIGHTS AND REALITIES . . . . . 128

Contract of Marriage—Former Ideas as to Marital Rights—Examples—Great Improvement over Past—Indicates Development of "Community Conscience"—Promises to Love and Honor—Psychological Impossibilities Unless Inspired—How to Hold a Love—Inspiration the Only Way—Suggestions—Habits and Mannerisms—Privacy and Reserve—Reproaches and Demands—Love to Give, Not to Get—Restore the Conditions before Marriage—Other Friendships—Fundamental Differences in Sex Expression—First Principles—The Eternal Woman—The Age-old Way—Equal Powers and Opportunities of the Sexes—The Woman's Part—Knowledge and Wisdom—Personal Attractiveness of Woman an Inspiration to Man—Nature's Way—Fancies and Affinities—Causes for Straying of Interest—Personal Negligence—The Way to Recover—Polarization and Repression—Transference as an Emotional Outlet—Finesse and Graciousness—Their Practical Value—Frankness and Finesse

—Rupert Hughes on Marriage—Is Marriage a Bunco Game?—The Golden Rule—Always Show Each Other only One's Best Side after Marriage as before.

CHAPTER XII

CONTINENCE AND FIDELITY . . . . 145

Psychology of Professional Attitude—Its Contrasts—Psychology of Subject Ignored—Opposing Viewpoints Max Huhner on Continence—His Citations from Old Writers—Psychology and Psychoanalysis Ignored—Conventional Attitude—Effects of Continence—Transformation or Repression—Sex a Personal Matter—Considerations Affecting Continence—Fidelity and Monogamy—Right Social Evolution—Suffering Inflicted—Secrecy and Deception—Self-respect—Æsthetic Considerations — Attunement — Risk of Disillusionment—Friendship and Inspiration—Remorse—The Happiness of Others Concerned—Self-control—FIDELITY—Meaning of the Word—Law and Church—Mental Fidelity—Physical or Heart Fidelity—The Bible on Fidelity—Treatment of Neglected Mates—Divided Interests—Effects on Conduct—Two Examples—Their Frequency—Superficial Judgments—A Broader View—Forel and Mental Substitution—Conflicting Opinions—Psychology of Forel Method—The Wife's Attitude—The Part of the Other Woman—Vicarious Fidelity—Ideals and Realities—Interest and Inspiration—Sex Interest Involuntary—Facts and Frankness—Individual Development and Conduct—Conventions Serve Race Needs—Self Control and Progress.

CHAPTER XIII

PSYCHOANALYSIS . . . . . . . 160

Remarkable Interest in Psychoanalysis—Psychoanalysis and Psychology—Psychology Appeals to Intellect—

Psychoanalysis Appeals to Emotions—New Light on Sexual Question—Excessive Application of Sexual Theory—Causes for It—The "Œdipus Complex"—Examples of Misapplication—Profound Influence of Psychoanalysis on Modern Thought—The Unconscious and its Activities—Psychic Energy and Creative Force—The Urges—Dream Signification as Index of Emotional Stress and Needs—The Censor—Dream Symbolism—Unfulfilled Desires—Rationalization and Self-analysis—Adverse Criticism—Examples—Contrast—Repressed Desire and Compensatory Antagonistic Outer Attitudes—Examples—Anthony Comstock—Hysteria and Neuroses—Their Frequent Origin in Unhappy Marriages—Their Ultimate Causes—Psychoanalytic Treatment—Success Depends on Will Power of Patient—The Reverse of Hypnotism—Examples of Treatment—Removal of the First Cause—Importance of Knowledge of Female Sexual Cycle in Psychoanalytic Treatment—Moral Courage and Truth.

CHAPTER XIV

INDIVIDUALISM AND ITS CONSEQUENCES . . 183

Modern Growth of Individualism—Increased Mental and Emotional Activity—Woman's Suffrage—Protected Lives of our Female Ancestors—Their Subservience and Dependence—The New Order—All that it Means—Importance of Right Trend of Individualism—A Common Working Rule of Conduct—Social Conventions and Sexual Freedom—Personal Responsibility for Example Set—William James on Habit—Individualism and License—Dangers of Free Love—Individualism in Marriage—Mismating—Reactionary Fears—The Old and the New—Love with and without Imagination—Reactionary Ideal is Inferiority—Divorce—United Opinion of Deepest Students—The Highest Good—The Attitude of the Church—

Effects of Freedom of Divorce—The Inevitable—Fairness towards Women—The Profound Symbolism of Short Skirts—Fashions and the Church.

CHAPTER XV

ECONOMIC STRESS . . . . . . 198

A New Type of Young Woman—Her Sex Standard—Facts about the Girls Themselves—Origin of Their Psychology—Marriage and Poverty—Influence of Education—Dread of Economic Slavery—Primitive Psychology of Female Chastity—Its Change under Modern Economic Stress—The Call of Sex—Free Love or Marriage?—The Handwriting on the Wall—The Need for a Constructive Alternative—W. L. George on the American Woman—Her Intolerable Economic Situation—Wife or Mother?—Domestic Drudgery—Lack of Understanding by Men—Frugality of our Early Ancestors—Incidence of Wealth—Idleness, Sex License and National Decay—Economic Causes—Modern Times and Machinery—Adam Smith and Later Observers—The Capitalistic System and the War—Slaves of the System—The Advent of Henry Ford—The Blind Momentum of the System—The Economic Problem and the Marriage Problem are Inseparable—The Signs of the Times.

CHAPTER XVI

MONOGAMY AND PROGRESS . . . . 210

National Sex Standards and Strengths—Northman and Latin—Outward Standards of Monogamy—Northern Attempt at Self-control in Sex—Latin Contempt for Same—Northern Ideals—Latin Cynicism—Turkey and Polygamy—Northern Nations Dominate Modern World—Psychology of Self-Control in Sex—Its Effect on Character and Efficiency—Male Tendency is Towards Polygamy—Female Tendency against Polygamy under Living Conditions—Present Tendency Result of Economic Stress—Monogamy Chosen by All Advanced Peoples—Indicates Woman's Growing Influence and Inspiration—Plurality of Women in Europe Following the War—Conventional Morality or Temporary Polygamy?—Their Practical Results—Conventions and Emergencies—National Birth Rates—Lesson of Monogamy in Self-control—Ideal of One Woman Ennobling—The Brighter Future.

CHAPTER XVII

ROOSEVELT ON MARRIAGE . . . . 218

His Views on Patriotism and Marriage—True for Majority—Require Modification for Minority—True Patriotism not Blind to Country's Faults—Love of Country not Necessarily Belief in Its Superiority—Recognition of Principle of National Equality—People of Mixed Stock Can and Do Love Two Countries Equally—Patriotism and Duty—Duty is Where Citizenship—Marriage—Can One Love a Third and Remain True?—Psychology of Love—Inspiration—Involuntary Reaction of Love—The Right Course of Action—Unselfish Love the Best Guide to Conscience—Analogy between Loving Two Countries and Two Men or Women—Love for Another Cannot be Killed but its Outer Expression can be Controlled by the Will—Richard Wagner—The Inspiration of a Great Love—Roosevelt and his Inspiration—Man's Greatest Monument to Woman and Wife—The Realized Ideal—Peter the Great.

CHAPTER XVIII

WOMAN THE CENTER . . . . . 232

Home not a Hearth but a Woman—Man's Greatest Inspiration—Man's Ideal of Woman—Its Influence in His Evolution — Bulwer-Lytton on Heart-rest — The

# CONTENTS

World's Unrest—Its Restraint on Efficiency and Output—Poet and Scientist Agree—Havelock Ellis on Sex and Liberation—A Famous Example—Love Transcendent—The Lesson of the Ages—The Highest Thought—"The Infinite Love."

# MARRIAGE AND EFFICIENCY

"The heart must rest, that the mind may be active."
Bulwer Lytton

# Marriage and Efficiency

## CHAPTER I

### IDEALS AND CONDITIONS

The dearest dream of almost every man and woman is of union with one beloved, and of the great happiness that each will give the other. This dream has sustained many through long years of up-hill and discouraging effort; effort to prepare for the home and the mate and the real fruition of life. And then, too often, come disillusionment and unhappiness. To many people who have had this bitter experience and compared notes with others, there seems to be no satisfactory answer or solution possible. It appears to them inevitable that married people sooner or later tire of each other and lose all mutual romantic interest. They accept what seems to be the inevitable, and thereafter live and act according to their natures or standards; either living together in mutual and faithful boredom; or seeking from other persons some measure of the felicity they had dreamed of finding in each other.

Fortunately for civilisation, however, there are others, disappointed but not disillusioned, who refuse to accept the pessimistic explanation for their unhappiness. They repel as false the idea that married happiness is necessarily impermanent or illusory, and passionately demand to know *why* it so often happens, and *how* it can be prevented.

Most people, deep in their hearts, if not in their minds, believe or rather feel that some kind of a higher supervision exists; that above and beyond all things material "Is fixt a Power divine which moves to good," and that ultimately "Only Its laws endure." They ask if it is credible that the Creative Power which is responsible for our existence should impel us to our noblest efforts through the inspiration of something which is not true? To them it is a libel on that Power divine to assume that It would employ a gross deceit in order to bring to pass Its ends. It is not forgotten that great happiness and spiritual uplift can indeed be found in love for children and in work of service for others. But a true mutual love experience between a man and woman gives to each something superlative and not comparable with anything else. In courtship and even in illicit love the same man and woman repeatedly enjoy such sublime experiences together. Why, then, so often after marriage, do lovers no longer mean the same to each other, who before had touched the Olympian Heights?

Because Love is of the Gods, its Temple sacred ground, which if profaned, casts out the offenders. Ignorance is no excuse, in sacred law as in common law. Disregard of the laws which govern human intercourse brings definite reactions. It makes no difference whether the disregard comes from ignorance, selfishness or carelessness. The results are the same—inharmony and suffering.

Those laws and their practical application to marriage are now understood, and it is the duty and the privilege of those who understand to spread their beneficent knowledge and make it available for all who need and desire it.

The first lesson is found in the obvious facts of ordinary social life all about us. Friendships of long standing are often severely strained or even broken under the ordeals of business partnerships or of closer domestic relationships. Mild friendships, or at any rate, enjoyable acquaintanceships, turn into indifference, boredom, or even positive dislike, when calls are made oftener than before, or near meal times, or when they last too long. People who have been reasonably good friends for many years while living far apart in distance, are delighted when it becomes possible for one family to move into the neighborhood of the other, or across the street, or better still in the same apartment house. Both have the pleasantest anticipations of the increasing intimacy that will then be possible. But alas!

for Auld Lang Syne! The closer association, from which so much was expected, soon begins to pall upon them. At first they wonder, then are disappointed, then hurt, and finally estranged.

Average Western humanity is not much given to introspection or self-analysis. When they think at all about waning friendships they account for them in a way perfectly satisfactory to themselves: they put the blame on the other side. They may perhaps recall the proverb: "You never know people until you live with them." They are pained and surprised to find faults and shortcomings in their friends they never before suspected. "What a pity "(they say)" that people are so disappointing and insincere! If they were only like ourselves!" If some mutual friend dared to suggest that they also might possibly have shortcomings that jarred on the others, that friend would probably forfeit his place in their circle and be thought of as another disappointment in friendship, another friend who did not wear well.

Many friendships, then, depend for their continuance on time and distance factors. Some writer has aptly classified friends as one mile friends, two mile friends, and so on. In terms of time we could say one hour or two hour friends, more or less, but generally less. Or in terms of Einstein: All friendship is *relative.*

So much for ordinary friendships. Turning from them to the aspect of friendship or affinity that is colored by difference in sex, the same thing is found, but on a greater and more serious scale. It is not necessary to refer to the numerous divorce cases and scandals that fill so much space in the daily papers; they merely are the crest of the great tidal wave of domestic inharmony. We need only look within our own social circle to find ample material for observation and study of the dull average of domestic discord. Among our numerous married friends how many couples are there whom we believe to be really happy, romantically happy, still lovers?

I once asked a friend why he had not married. He was a physician, a cultured, refined and fascinating man. This was his reply: "I am afraid to. The prospect is too discouraging. Of all my classmates who married, half are divorced, and the other half want to be."

The monogamous marriage and the family life are generally held to be the bulwarks of enduring civilizations. And yet they are being abandoned by both men and women, and apparently in increasing numbers, either through despair of finding enduring happiness, or because of economic stress.

For some time now the Institution of Marriage has been like a ship without a pilot, drifting in fogs of uncertainty and inharmony. Only a few have ears that can hear the boom of the surf on the distant reef, towards which the marriage ship is steadily drifting. And that earnest few, alive to the danger, are trying to change the course before it is too late.

The problem is in a sense as old as civilization. But in recent years and under vastly changed conditions of living it has taken on many new features. So great now is the stress and so poignant the cry for relief that every possible effort should be made to give out the knowledge which is the remedy for, and the prevention of, married unhappiness in the majority of instances.

The immense importance of public health is just beginning to be realized as a national asset. It is the truest wealth of a nation. But health is a far wider thing than freedom from certain contagious diseases. It is now known that health is profoundly influenced by many factors formerly ignored, by occupations and customs, by social habits, and especially by thought and emotion. Recent studies in neuro-physiology and psychoanalysis, and earlier work in hypnotism, demonstrate that the influences of thought and emotion are enormous on physical and mental health and on efficiency.

In the presence of such definite scientific knowledge it is obvious that a social system whose atmosphere is charged with unhappiness and morbid thought cannot be functioning at its best. Such negative thought and emotion must invariably react destructively on physical health and efficiency.

It is theoretically and legally wrong for a hungry man to steal food. But if he is starving he will take it if he can, right or wrong. Conscience with a full purse and a full stomach is one thing. Conscience with poverty and hunger is another.

So with married virtue. Happiness is heart satisfaction, and unhappiness is heart hunger. Where marriage gives happiness, virtue is easy. Where marriage denies happiness, there is heart hunger; and heart hunger, like food hunger, first craves and then *demands* satisfaction. Only a well fed fool would tell a starving man not to steal food. But what should be our attitude towards married people suffering with heart hunger?

This question shakes the foundations of Western society. The analogy between food hunger and heart hunger is obvious, but there are grave and far-reaching reasons which prevent us from answering off-hand, "satisfy your heart hunger where you can." Those reasons are discussed in several later chapters. The marriage problem has many aspects—physical, mental, emotional, ethical, pragmatic, economic—and therefore gears in with the entire machinery of social structure and social evolution.

Let us drop camouflage and face facts. Inharmony in marriage grows steadily. Inharmony means unhappiness, and, in the view of the most advanced science, unhappiness is the equivalent of disease. In every instance where a disease progresses unchecked, it eventually ruins or kills the body which is its host. So with married unhappiness. It is a true social disease. Unless something is done to stop it in the aggregate, the Institution of Marriage will be threatened. It is better to face the situation before the situation faces Society. Here are some of the facts:

1. Marriage is a *failure* in an appalling number of instances.

2. The common alternatives for married unhappiness are infidelity and free love.

3. The lesson of History is that when a civilisation abandons chastity for sex license, its break-up is approaching.

4. The majority of unhappy marriages are in the cultured classes; among the intellectual and artistic, the sensitive and refined; in a word, the *developed* people who represent the brains and vision and progress of the Race.

That is the situation, of which Bernard Shaw says: "There is no shirking it; if marriage cannot be made to produce something better than we are, marriage will have to go, or else the nation will have to go." Shaw was thinking of Great Britain, but he might as well have spoken for the United States.

Long investigation of the marriage problem shows that the incidence of happiness or sorrow depends on many factors or conditions, but they may for the moment be summarized in five: Ignorance, selfishness, carelessness, lack of frankness, and economic stress.

Ignorance is by far the most serious and catastrophic. In marriage more than anywhere else it covers innumerable sins. It involves disregard of the laws which regulate human intercourse in partnership, friendship, and in sex relationships.

Selfishness is in large extent a result of ignorance, for when knowledge replaces ignorance it is then seen that selfishness is futile and in the end self-destructive. Marriage is intended to be above all else a *union*, while selfishness tends always the other way, towards separation.

Carelessness is a serious vice anywhere, limiting efficiency and stamping one as unreliable and unsafe. In marriage it is especially dangerous and destructive, because it ignores the fine emotional adjustments which are essential in maintaining harmony and mutual love interest. Carelessness is incompatible with success in any line, and in marriage it is disastrous to romance.

Lack of frankness is responsible for much misunderstanding and consequent unhappiness. It arises partly from diffidence and partly from sensitiveness—both of which mean self-consciousness, lack of confidence in oneself, and lack of trust in the other. Frankness is essential for mutual success in all partnerships and contracts, and marriage is the most important and vital of partnerships.

Economic stress, when severe, is the most obstinate limitation in marriage because the most difficult to overcome. The previous four conditions are all subject to volition and control, and therefore are preventable. Economic stress, however, especially since the World War, often forms a barrier which individual will and energy cannot surmount. Romance and poverty do not long hold together in real life. Poverty means discomfort, sordidness, dirt, and general ugliness; while romance connotes and requires the opposite conditions. If denied them in large measure, romance fades and dies, like a rose transplanted from its sunny garden to a foul cellar.

In sum, the principal causes of married unhappiness, excepting severe economic stress, are in the main like the causes of most diseases —preventable.

# CHAPTER II

## PERMANENT INCOMPATIBILITIES

EVERY normal union *must* have an approximately normal physical basis, otherwise no genuine, strong, mutual, romantic (sex) interest can be present or maintained. Indeed that might go without saying. It is because an abnormal physical union lacks the element of mutual beauty, and an unbeautiful physical union cannot be a medium for love exchanges. (I will discuss in another chapter what I mean by beauty.) Such sentiment as may sometimes accompany an abnormal physical union may be devoted and self-sacrificing and even very noble in a mistaken sense, on the part of the normal partner, but it is sterile as to romance. Speaking more strongly, an abnormal physical marriage is a sin against love, an eugenic crime, and should and eventually will be a statutory crime. From the racial standpoint, no normal individual has a right to link himself or herself with a defective, be the motive noble or quixotic. The modern eugenic attitude toward marriage receives support from a remarkable passage in the Hebrew Sacred writings, which says, "All defectives are bad." That statement taken literally would seem harsh, unjust or cryptic except to students of Oriental philosophy who are familiar with the theories of Karma and Reincarnation. Such students will of course understand that the phrase, "All defectives are bad" means that defectives are such because of their crimes in former lives; and furthermore, measuring cause by effect, that their past records must have been very bad indeed. Extreme selfishness and even vanity are often present in hunchbacks.

*Age.* Great disproportion in ages is an impassable barrier to love. The so-called love of a very old man for a young wife is often nothing but a kind of post-mortem passion. It would be pathetic if it were not so completely and ignobly selfish. The logical sequence of senile passion is senile jealousy, with or without cause, but usually and naturally with cause.

*Health.* Common sense dictates that only healthy persons should marry. The presence of a chronic incurable disease in one partner, even if not communicable, not only affects that one's physical efficiency, but inhibits emotional responsiveness. Hence the diseased partner is incapable of being the physical or emotional complement of the healthy one; he or she is not a mate but an encumbrance.

*Habits.* A bad or disagreeable physical habit or appetite is like a chronic disease; indeed drink and drug habits are true diseases. Many women have married men, knowing of their habits, but believing in their promises that they would reform after marriage. The common and sad experience is that such promises are seldom kept, and the unfortunate women soon realize that they are linked to men permanently disagreeable and incompatible, or to drunkards or drug fiends. The rule is that men who do not reform before marriage *cannot* do so afterwards.

*Snoring.* This atrocious habit in one of the pair may be enough in itself to cause disgust in the other and quickly kill out all romance. Snoring is bad enough taken by itself as noise, but there is also to be considered the *appearance* of the snorer. Poets, at any rate the older poets, have often been enthusiastic over sleeping beauty. Perhaps people have changed, but however that may be we poor disillusioned moderns know that many of us do not look our best when asleep. Indeed, some look their very worst. This is notably so with snorers, whose expression may be profoundly unlovely and even idiotic. Snoring, like other bad habits, can be cured if there is sufficient will power and a sincere desire to be cured. All that is necessary is to employ someone to sit up all night with the sleeper and wake him every time he snores. One night may suffice, but it may take several until the unconscious or subjective mind is definitely impressed with the desire to stop the snoring. Also, snorers should have their noses and throats examined by specialists.

*Religion.* Difference in religious belief may become a serious or even hopeless cause of discord, if one or both take their beliefs very earnestly as to the mere outer forms. And yet such a situation, like certain diseases, is entirely preventable. But the cure requires sufficient intelligence and liberality on the part of the pair to enable them to examine each other's beliefs. If they sincerely do so they will inevitably find that both agree perfectly as to essentials, and differ only in non-essentials. By essentials I mean the three basic teachings of all religions worthy of the name: (1) The existence of a Supreme Being or God; (2) The immortality of the soul; and (3) good conduct. Very regrettably, however, most people, and even priests and ministers of religion seldom emphasize these essential things, but instead major the innumerable minor differences, the doctrinal barnacles which attach themselves and grow on all churches and progressively impede their movement and usefulness as vehicles of divine expression. If one partner is such a bigot as to cling to the forms of a particular church or sect, and the other partner is hostile to them, their situation may be hopeless, because nothing is so inaccessible as the closed mind of religious intolerance, of whatever church. Hence marked difference in religious belief is a serious matter in marriage, especially when it comes to the education of the children.

*Temperament.* Apart altogether from selfishness is the fact that certain natures require and crave more demonstration than others. Their physical nervous systems actually demand more exercise than those of other people. When such ardent natures are linked with cold or much less ardent ones, the inevitable result will be dissatisfaction. The ardent one will feel thwarted, and the other oppressed. If the difference in demonstrative power is considerable, nothing can be done, and the two are permanently incompatible.

*Selfishness.* Extreme selfishness in one partner, whatever the social class, constitutes a permanent incompatibility for that pair which nothing else can make up for. Extreme selfishness signifies lack of personal development, and that of course means inferiority. The union is therefore fundamentally hopeless in any higher sense, because there is nothing to build upon. To continue to live together could have no other results than to emphasize the bad qualities of the selfish one, and the gradual deterioration of the better one.

*Caste.* Differences in social class, if very marked, may constitute a permanent barrier between any pair. Not because of the differences in themselves, but on account of what those differences may mean in class habits, points of view, mannerisms, modes of speech and action, and general culture. Probably all have seen examples of marrying out of class, where one highly educated and refined is yoked with another just the reverse. And having seen, one can understand what that means. The developed personality suffers acutely from the other's inaccessible ignorance and lack of comprehension, and perhaps more than all the rest, uncouthness and vulgarity. The undeveloped partner is mystified and wonders what is the matter. He or she vaguely feels the other's superiority and writhes under it. And that unconscious recognition of inferiority takes expression outwardly as touchiness and mulishness, which are the unconscious, defensive reactions of all undeveloped personalities. The higher one may, by the steady pull of the commonplace, be gradually dragged down to its level but the lower can never rise to the other's level. It sometimes happens, however, that developed personalities are born into and raised in undeveloped classes. When they marry into a higher caste they usually make sincere and determined efforts to acquire the manners and polish of their new environment. And they will succeed, though occasionally, under provocation or alcohol, the suppressed habits of early life will reassert themselves in all their original uncouthness. Yet early training can wonderfully accelerate personal evolution, as where children from the slums are occasionally adopted by wealthy families and reared under refining influences of a cultured environment.

*Interests.* Where two people who may be called developed have only one interest in common, they will inevitably tire of each other. For example: The man loves business, politics, theaters and cabarets. The wife, in addition to her home and her children, loves art, music, and higher thought. He is bored by art, music, and thought. She is bored by business details and politics. She occasionally enjoys the theater but detests cabarets. Their only meeting ground of common interest is—sex. And even their sex interest is not wholly in common because they each approach it from widely differing points of view; he entirely from the material, she more from the æsthetic and spiritual. So neither really satisfies the other in the only common interest they had when they began their married life, and when *that* interest ceases to be mutual, they begin to realize the dreary fact that although wedded for life they are far apart as the Poles. More is said on this subject in the chapter on Variety of Interests.

*Economic Stress.* Continuous and severe economic stress may become a complete barrier against love and romance. Such stress means crowding in uncomfortable rooms, lack of personal privacy and reserve, double beds, treading on each other's feet, sordid economy, no diversions, and no getting away from each other. No matter how strong a love may be at first, it cannot hold indefinitely against that constant and sordid bombardment. Long continued physical pain upsets the equilibrium of body and nervous systems, and centers the consciousness in one desire—to get rid of the pain at whatever sacrifice. Long continued *psychical* pain acts similarly, not only interfering with bodily functions, but by bringing profound weariness and disgust it disorganizes the emotional nature, chokes out higher thought and aspiration, and leaves only the despairing hope of some day and somehow escaping from the "slough of despond" which marriage has become. I will say more on Economic Stress in the chapter on that subject.

# CHAPTER III

## THE SEXUAL CYCLE

One of the most important single facts bearing on the marriage problem is the recent discovery by Doctor Marie Carmichael Stopes of London of the Sexual Cycle in Women. Restatement may be a better word than discovery, for the sexual cycle has been vaguely surmised for a long time. A correct understanding of it, by men at least, is essential to the happiness of many people. Hereafter sex education should include instruction in regard to this cycle. After marriage it is even more important that the man should understand the cycle than the woman. This will be self-evident when the problem is explained. I regret that as a citizen of the United States, I am prevented from recommending, or even naming, Dr. Stopes' book, as under Section 211 of the Criminal Code it is excluded from the U. S. Mails.

First of all, Dr. Stopes disposes of the fallacy believed in by many that the menstrual period is a time of sexual activity or desire. On the contrary it is usually the reverse of this, the nadir point, in which the sexual tide is at lowest ebb. Before and afterwards there occur two periods or phases, one very definite, the other often less so, during which the sexual tide, or creative impulse, rises and reaches its maximum. Dr. Stopes' charts show that these two positive phases occur at practically fortnightly intervals, with the menstrual or negative phase about midway between them.

Now will be obvious the value of this knowledge to husbands, though not necessarily so to wives. Men who understand and who are sufficiently unselfish and self-controlled to restrain themselves until each fortnightly phase comes around will usually find their reward in the ideal responses they will receive during the three or four days of each positive phase. Without this knowledge it is easy to see why disappointment and misunderstanding so often come.

Although the foregoing may be taken as a general rule, the duration of the periods of desire or responsiveness vary widely in different women, and in many it excepts *only* the time of menstruation. There is still another exception, however. In occasional women the sexual high tide is synchronous with menstruation, and consequently they are *then* most fascinating and magnetic. Men who truly love their wives will study them and learn the signs of the phases of their cycles. They are plain enough to any lover,—as plain as the red or white rose which are said to have been the symbols worn by Camille.

Knowledge of the sexual cycle will often have a protective value to women, before and after marriage. The whole question of "psychological moments" turns largely around the pivotal points of the sexual cycle. An attractive woman, while at the negative point of the cycle, might be introduced to a man agreeable and interesting. His manly qualities might make little impression on her at the time, because she was not then in a mood to feel masculine attraction. Also, being in her negative phase, she would not appear or act at her best, and could not radiate enough magnetism to particularly attract the sex interest of the man. Hence this meeting would not be likely to produce much mutual impression. But instead let the same two meet about twelve days later. The woman would then be at one of the positive phases of the sexual cycle. She would be animated, radiant, magnetic, and "at her best." The man would immediately be attracted, and the woman would enjoy the impression she had made. Such a meeting might easily lead to love, engagement, courtship, and marriage.

Much that passes for love at first sight depends on the phases of the female sexual cycle. Surely a more reasonable and attractive theory than the gross conception of some psychoanalysts, which is that love at first sight is merely the instant recognition by each in the other of the parent fixation type or incest complex! Disregarding that theory except as it may apply to abnormal personalities, there are at least five hypotheses to account for love at first sight:

1. The meeting of a man and woman coinciding with one of the positive phases of her sexual cycle.

2. A response evoked by mutual beauty, or the mutual possession of the fetiches which appeal to each.

3. Sympathetic vibration, or the synchronous adjustment of both personalities, analogous to the responsive vibration of two tuning forks keyed to the same pitch. Looking farther backward, this may be due to

4. Mutual intuitive recognition of an old love tie from a former life. I would remind readers to whom this statement may appear fantastic, that belief in Reincarnation is almost general throughout the Orient, including men of the highest intellectual attainment. Furthermore, apart from personal memories of many persons which are not necessarily evidence for others, there is now available the

record of some exceedingly interesting research work done with subjects in deep hypnotic trance, in which personal consciousness was carried back through infancy and beyond until other personalities and names were reached; and, above all in importance, certain alleged revelations from former lives have apparently been corroborated by documentary evidence. Consult *Les Vies Successives*, by A. De Rochas, Chacornac Freres, Paris.

5. Astronomical correspondences at their respective birth times. Many years ago an original study of some of the famous affinities of history was made from this standpoint by the late Richard Garnett, Librarian of the British Museum. His data are correct, and the correspondences and deductions are clear to anyone able to follow them astronomically. While the subject is rather too complicated to be explained in a paragraph, some idea of it may be conveyed by saying that the most frequent correspondences noted in cases of great and durable love were interchanges of the positions of the Sun and Moon at birth.

Consult *The Soul and the Stars*, by A. G. Trent (Richard Garnett, *University Magazine*, March, 1880). Also the review, *Nature*, Vol. 50, 1894.

Resuming the consideration of the sexual cycle in women, it is during the positive phases that everything has a significance not noticed before; the flashing glances, the electric touches, the rhythm, music and intimate contact in dancing. For the time-being nothing counts but the mutual glamour of sex difference. The heart is rife with the joy of life, and the entire personality is irradiated as with a divine fire.

For the time being, it would be impossible to know whether the two had any other fields of common or mutual interest. These could only be discovered and known with certainty during the negative phases of the cycle, when the veil of passional illusion had somewhat thinned, and consideration of impersonal things became possible.

Natures that are sensitive and trained to know the beautiful wherever present, can recognize the essential elements of what means beauty to them independently of sexual cycles or other things. Many a doctor or nurse has found their great romances at sick beds, where the one beloved, or to be loved, was æsthetically at his or her worst, and perhaps continuing so for many days or weeks. Propinquity and pity naturally may have figured somewhat here; also, it is well recognized that we are prone to love those whom we have helped or nursed or saved from danger. But I am inclined to believe that propinquity, pity, and service operate mainly in that they bring about intimacies which discover the fields of mutual interest that are open to a given pair. Not by any means every couple, or the majority of couples, brought thus into intimate association, develop a sex interest strong enough or enduring enough to cause them to seek marriage. We are apt to base our conclusions on a few and perhaps conspicuous cases in our own circle of friends. In the same incompetent way many people carelessly and recklessly repeat the statement that clergymen's sons always become gamblers or drunkards: While the facts are that a very few clergymen's sons have led wild lives, and because of the glaring contrast of their lives with the profession of their fathers, their particular antics attracted rather more attention than they could possibly have done if their fathers had not been clergymen.

It is safe to say that the marriages of average young men and women are made mostly from motives of sex glamour, initiated at the psychological moments of the cycles of the women. Not having been considered from any other standpoint than the sexual, we are apt, at first thought, to regard such marriages as ill-considered. But are we necessarily right in that view? Average young people are not very intellectual, artistic, musical, or otherwise gifted. They are creatures of strong impulses, desires, appetites, and emotions. Any average young man and any average young woman, given health and reasonable attractiveness, should be about as suitable to each other as to any others of like natural equipment. The primal purposes of Nature are the carrying on of the life, and the character evolution people acquire by the discipline of living together. Is it then, a very vital matter whether a given normal young man marries this or that normal young woman, or vice versa?

The question of fine discrimination in the selection of the mate becomes important and vital only to men and women of developed mental and emotional natures, of intellectual and artistic culture. With them it is most important that they are not drawn by temporary sex glamour into unions with persons who cannot commune with them in other fields besides that of sex. Consequently it should be of very great practical value to them to know the facts about the female sexual cycle. Such knowledge would cause many a look before leaping into marriage. The "psychological moments" and "the time, the place and the girl," are well enough to make the marriages of the undeveloped and uncultured. But others should be more cautious, and though enjoying such "moments" with a vividness and exaltation far beyond the comprehension of less developed individuals, the wonderful first impressions should always be checked by later and fuller acquaintance, and by the finding of an enduring foundation of diversified mutual interests.

While knowledge of the sexual cycle in women is all important in many cases, it is practically useless unless one other detail is remembered. All authorities agree that women are generally slower to arrive at the culmination of sexual union than men. That moment should coincide with both, otherwise there is no true reciprocal union. In every such instance the woman is left stirred but not satisfied. In the united opinion of gynecologists and psychoanalysts those unsatisfactory unions for women are the causes of most cases of uterine congestion and many of hysteria and neuroses. It is therefore strictly up to husbands who love their wives, and to men expecting to marry, to bear in mind this very important consideration and to act accordingly.

*Birth Control.* While it is not intended to discuss in any detail the subject of birth control in this book, a brief reference to it should be made on account of its bearing on married happiness. Broadly speaking, the association of the sexes has two objects, (1) the carrying on of the racial life, and (2) the character development and spiritual evolution. Both objects are co-equal in importance. The advent of a child is the most dramatic incident of marriage, and its subsequent influence on the emotional natures of the parents is profound and lasting—or should be.

When the Earth was young, and life more natural, and human problems more simple, the matter of human reproduction could well be left to itself. But all that has changed. Amid the present-day economic stress, the resultant less vigorous health of modern woman, and the almost universal education in advanced nations, the incidence of children into families should no longer be left entirely to chance or to psychological moments,—at least for developed people.

Economically speaking, if a pair cannot properly bring up more than, say, two children, it is obviously not right for them to have more. From the standpoint of health, if a modern highly organized and sensitive woman cannot bear more than, say, two children, or even one, without harm to her continued efficiency, she should not do so or be forced to do so.

Again, from the standpoint of character and ethics there is an immense difference between (1) the man and woman who, with knowledge and the power of choice, deliberately take on themselves the sacred obligation of parenthood and the considerable mutual sacrifice it will carry with it; and (2) the man and woman who know nothing and care for nothing but the sensations derived from moments of sex passion, and to whom children come as mere accidents and are often unwelcome.

I have observed that persons of the first type, those who deliberately and nobly and with dignity have become parents, retain for each other an affection which time only strengthens; while those of the second type often develop more and more mutual irritation and loss of respect. The man is irrationally irritated with his wife for becoming pregnant so often and thus interfering with his pleasure and "rights." The wife is irritated with the man as being the selfish cause of her troubles and for making her a household drudge. Fortunately, however, the development of the parental instincts somewhat redeem the sordid situation as the children grow up around them.

Before the World War the Continental European ideal of national grandeur embodied the idea of immense families, especially among the lower classes, to furnish millions of men for military service and for slaughter. The Church teaches the same, not for military puposes but to spread its religion and strengthen its organization.

The new and saner ideal substitutes construction and conservation for destruction and waste, and therefore finds no further need for the propagation of human beings on the guinea pig scale. Instead, it teaches fewer children and better children and a more developed humanity. Says Havelock Ellis in a recently published article:

> The production of children is not so urgent a matter today as it was in those legendary days when Noah emerged from the door of the Ark onto an empty world. In fact the urgency is now the other way, and the next flood to overwhelm and ruin the earth is far more likely to be of babies than of waters. The only children the earth needs now are those who are worth something to it, and for the production of children who are really worth while there are wanted parents who are fitted both by their natural hereditary qualities and their special training for the noble task of creating the future race.

Reactionary influences are still too strong, however, and the majority of the people as yet too undeveloped to profit much by such teaching. But to those who give it intelligent thought, the matter of discriminating birth control is one of the most vitally important considerations for the immediate future.

# CHAPTER IV

## PERSONAL HYGIENE

David Graham Phillips, in *Old Wives for New*, tells how Sophy, the once beautiful girl and bride, has degenerated into a careless, fat, sloppy wife. She realizes that she seldom bathes now, and that her hair has not been washed for months, and that her one-time beautiful body is growing always more fat and shapeless. But she excuses herself by remembering that that hair and that bosom had served their purpose when they secured a husband and a home. So why trouble about them any more? The story then goes on to tell, and with amazing frankness for a work of fiction, how the wife and the—in that case—more sensitive husband occupied the conventional and sacred double bed; how he became progressively more disgusted and even nauseated by the odors from her unwashed body and the sour smell from her unwashed hair; and even, the author dares to say, of other odors whose sources he does not mention, but leaves to the reader to guess. At last, unable to endure it any longer, the husband comes to the (at that time) momentous decision to sleep in a separate bed. Eventually, of course, he meets another woman who has the personal beauty and charm and sweetness his wife once had, and inevitably turns to her.

It is well known that all successful writers of fiction draw their most convincing material from life and experience. Therefore it is a foregone conclusion that Phillips did not draw on his imagination for all that detail about Sophy's deterioration, but instead that he had an actual case or cases in mind as he wrote. My own professional experience as the confidant of many unhappy people supports the latter view. And therefore I say, and as earnestly as I can, that it would be well if all married and engaged people read that book, as a warning against any latent tendency to relax in their efforts to appear always at their very best when in each other's presence. Here, then, is one source of trouble in marriage which is very real, more common than one would think possible among cultured people, and—*entirely preventable.*

It is not pleasant to write this chapter. But to ignore personal hygiene in this book would be to assume an attitude of æsthetic prudery, a kind of Freudian repression, comparable with that of the sexual prudery of our ancestors towards sex facts, which was responsible for the age of "fig leaf morality" as Fielding calls it, now, happily, in process of senile degeneration. At first thought, however, it certainly does seem unnecessary to discuss the crude and obvious details of personal hygiene in a book which is addressed only to people having culture, refinement, and æsthetic sense. And yet the experience of physicians agrees that there are numerous instances of remarkable obtuseness and negligence among people of social position and education who apparently have refinement.

The higher we go in the scale of evolution, the more frequently we find people of extreme delicacy and sensitiveness towards certain physical things. Such sensitiveness is capable of being stimulated to feel either intense pleasure or intense disgust. This is notably true as to odors. Thus a finely organized man or woman may keenly enjoy a delicate perfume, or be affected almost to nausea by some slightly disagreeable odor that another person would be hardly or not even aware of.

First, then, as to odors. Some writer has said: "Love begins at the nose." There is a crudely material aspect of that which we need not go into here. But apart from that it is an accepted fact that the attractiveness of a woman may be enhanced or diminished by the perfumes she uses or does not use. Or the natural faint perfume emanating from a scrupulously clean body or head of hair may be thought by some as more attractive than any artificial perfume. Then as to breath. A pure healthful breath is almost odorless, and even pleasant, at any rate to a lover. The operatic hero sings: "Thy breath as incense sweet." To recapitulate, the natural odors of a clean body and a pure breath are not unpleasant, and may even be thought agreeable where people love each other. In friendship and courtship between a man and woman they always deliberately try to appear before each other as agreeably as possible and in every way; of course bathing and general spruceness are the rule.

After marriage, however, as part of the deterioration complex in conduct, there is apt to come a tendency to slack off somewhat in personal appearance and hygiene. A man will sometimes omit his morning shave and bath, or even neglect to brush his teeth at night. A woman may neglect not only her daily bath but leave her hair unwashed for a long time, until it begins to smell mouldy or mousey. One or both may neglect their teeth or digestion until bad breath results; and *then* they are on dangerous ground.

As already said, many a man or woman is acutely sensitive to odors, and especially to disagreeable personal ones. When such a man or woman notices an offensive odor from the person of the one admired or beloved, it comes as a real shock and inspires a feeling almost of revulsion, and that feeling of revulsion may be hard to overcome or to forget. Such experiences are rare, or indeed they never occur, to a pair of *lovers*, not because of blind love, but because in *that* stage of their association they *think* about making themselves personally attractive and magnetic, and they take especial pains to do so. It is only after marriage that vigilance is relaxed and personal appearance and cleanliness and breath are neglected.

Speaking very practically, the daily bath should be a matter of inflexible routine. More than that, it should be regarded as a duty, as a religious duty. If conditions of crowding or of cold make a complete bath difficult or unwise, then a *partial* daily bath will usually suffice to prevent disagreeable odors. The Italians of the better class are distinctly ahead of us in certain sanitary plumbing which makes *this* kind of personal hygiene easy and pleasant. Every bathroom is equipped with a kind of miniature tub so shaped that one can sit over and astride of it. There are hot and cold water taps, and an agreeable cleansing partial bath can be taken without undressing, which is satisfactory for the purposes of this chapter. The same apparatus can serve also for a foot bath.

The matter of bad breath is so vitally important in marriage that it must be taken up in some detail. Bad breath may come from at least six causes: (1) Teeth decayed or affected with pyorrhœa alveolaris. (2) Constipation. (3) Diseased tonsils or adenoids. (4) Ozæna, a chronic nasal disease. (5) Chronic gastritis. (6) The food eaten, as onions or garlic. All of those conditions will respond, most of them completely, to medical or surgical treatment. Pyorrhœa is the most obstinate and probably is not so much a local disease as a symptom of a constitutional condition. It has been known to disappear under treatment internally with a French preparation of colloidal iodine.

Generally speaking, bad breath is evidence of neglect of personal hygiene, such as dentistry and laxatives, or better, correct diet. Tooth brushes, dental floss, and cascara are always and easily available. The eating of onions or garlic by one partner when the other detests the resulting reek of the breath is simply hopeless, and a person so selfish or obtuse as to do that could hardly be expected to benefit by advice from any source.

The care of the feet is next in order, and *very important.* Many people's feet perspire, and sometimes they have an odor. Being used to the odor themselves, they do not realize how vilely disgusting it is to other people. Often in a theater one will see a man get up and speak to the usher, and then he and his companion are shown to other seats; someone near them had "feet." It would be cruel to call attention to such an affliction if it were not easily curable. Moderate cases of perspiring feet can be controlled by frequent bathing and liberal use of scented boro-talcum powder. Severe cases with bad odor can be cured by taking a teaspoonful of powdered sulphur morning and evening for from one to two weeks. Of course the sulphur should be taken in something like syrup or molasses, otherwise it will stick between the teeth and be rather hard to wash down. Probably it is not necessary to say that the taking of the sulphur internally should be supplemented by a daily foot bath and use of powder. In sum, the daily foot bath should be thought of and practiced as a *sacred duty*.

Excessive perspiration under the arms used to be a very annoying limitation to many attractive people. One remembers with horror the ugly and obvious dress shields women were formerly compelled to wear. But Science, the servant of Necessity, came to the rescue and solved the vexatious problem. Preparations which prevent perspiring under the arms are now on sale in all drug stores, and there is no longer any excuse for enduring or obtruding on others that infirmity. A recent and clever magazine advertisement gave a picture of a ballroom showing two women in evening gowns standing a little apart from the others and conversing about a third woman who was sitting alone in a corner and looking wistfully at the dancers. One of the two women asked the other why Miss——was so seldom asked to dance. The other replied that it was because "the poor thing suffers so from perspiration." Now advertisements, like jests, sometimes speak the truth. This one would never have been written by a psychologist, designed by a highly paid artist, and published at the cost of some $4,000 for *one* Saturday issue, if it had not been well known that it applied emphatically and unromantically to very many women. The disagreeable fact of the excessive perspiration itself is of course made worse by the rank odor that goes with it. This and other unpleasant physiological odors are abominations which have no place with beauty and with love. If it is sometimes true, as has been said, that "Love begins at the nose," it is probably also true that in some cases love ends at the nose.

The hygiene of menstruation is very important in marriage, especially if the husband happens to be somewhat over-sensitive and fastidious. To understand this clearly let us take a glance at first principles. Menstruation is one of the great cyclic rhythms of Nature, and one of its purposes seems to be to assure the woman—the future mother—of definite periods during which she will be protected from sexual advances. This being admitted, it follows that one of Nature's protective measures at that time is to make woman *less attractive* to man than that at other times. Consequently there is not only the unpleasant feature of the menstrual flow itself, but also the accompaniment of an *unpleasant odor*. An innately sensitive woman realizes this, and though frankly admitting her condition she takes care, by means of scrupulous cleanliness and perfumes, not to obtrude it on her husband. During this of all times it is advisable to occupy separate beds.

Yet many women seem to fail to sense the essential unattractiveness of the menstrual condition and allow it to become obvious. The carelessness of some women otherwise sensitive is hard to understand at those times. At the shrine of the medical confessional men have told of their annoyance at such carelessness. Surgeons in the Atlantic passenger service have considerable professional experience with women of the higher social levels. Some of those surgeons have reported many instances of gross carelessness and uncleanliness among such women during menstruation; as using steamer towels, and leaving them, just as they were, in their berths or on cabin floors, or rolled up under their pillows.

Balzac was a profound psychologist and observer of personal relationships. Nothing escaped him. He portrayed life as he saw it, with the skill of a master and the frankness of a Frenchman. In his *Deux Jeunes Mariées* is his picture of the mistress who, with the finesse and consummate tact of the Frenchwoman in these matters, rose every morning at dawn, bathed, and, completely refreshed, slipped back beside her lover, to greet him, fresh as a rose, when he awoke. Such a strenuous routine might become irksome as a steady thing, but the idea is based on sound sense. In the ultimate psychology of sex the woman must always *attract* the man, and if she desires to *hold* him she must maintain her personal attractiveness. Unfair, perhaps, but true.

Referring again to odors, there are several things that *man* also should not forget. Men wear heavier clothing than women, and therefore they perspire more, especially under the arms and about the genitalia, and their underwear soon becomes sweat soaked. If not frequently changed it quickly emanates rank odors. Sensitive women say that the odor from men's underwear is generally stronger and more disagreeable than from women's, and that even after laundering the odor remains, and is noticed particularly when being ironed.

Tailors are now recommending for men the use of preparations to check perspiration under the arms. For other parts of the body the difficulty is relieved by frequent bathing. The Hindus also wear a triangular piece of cloth, changed daily, which takes up practically all perspiration and other secretions and keeps that part of the underwear clean and without odors. This simple device is described in an interesting and helpful booklet entitled *Continence and Sexual Hygiene*, by Pramatha Nath Dey.

All married men should seriously remember that sensitive women suffer tortures when vile personal odors are obtruded on them. One of the quickest and surest ways to disgust such women and to alienate their affection and sex interest is for men to be careless in the matters just dealt with. It would be a wholesome reminder to many careless men if some able woman would write a gripping novel on the sins of men in this respect, corresponding to David Graham Phillips' book *Old Wives for New*. Cleanliness has been recognized as a supreme virtue from time immemorial. One simply cannot imagine purity or decency that is not associated with it. In fact as in sentiment, "Cleanliness is next to Godliness."

Negligence or slacking in attention to personal attractiveness is therefore one of the causes for a development of indifference, or worse, by one partner. And the commonest and worst aspect of such negligence is lack of attention to personal cleanliness. Regrettable and most unromantic as it is to say so, this unpardonable sin against love appears to be as common among women as with men. This is not alone the verdict of men but also of women. Let me quote one of them, an artist friend:

> I am often surprised as well as disgusted when standing or sitting by well dressed and refined looking young women to notice the disagreeable odors that come from them—odors that come from lack of bathing and nothing else. And then I feel like saying to them, "Are you married? Does any man have to live with you?"

When such a careless and dense person marries a sensitive one, that one is quickly disgusted, and the first effect of the disgust is to render him or her cold and unresponsive, or even sexually impotent or frigid towards the mate. Such a situation makes a true psychic trauma in their union which may be impossible to recover from. It cannot be offset by superior mentality or noble character. Furthermore, the situation may be hopeless for two fundamental reasons: (1) Because the mate, in spite of the possession of noble qualities and fine abilities, is somewhat deficient in intuition, and that being so, might be incapable of appreciating what would appear as the other's unreasonable over-sensitiveness and finickiness. (2) The offended one, as a rule, would not tell the other the true reason for his or her coldness. A strong inner reluctance would make them almost tongue-tied about discussing such a matter together. For one thing, they would feel sure that to speak of it would hurt the pride and wound the feelings of the other, and of course they would shrink from doing that. Moreover, they might reason, if analytically inclined, that anyone however estimable otherwise who had to be told of some entirely preventable uncleanliness and smelliness of their body might be too æsthetically dense to profit by the information. Anyway, they would finally conclude, the mere telling of it would be so damnably disagreeable that they would prefer to keep silent until perhaps he or she learned through some other source than themselves.

Such an *impasse* between a man and wife is bad, but not hopeless, *provided* that the offending wife or offending husband can be made to realize that the other's point of view is really and essentially vital to that one, though it may *seem* exaggerated or fantastic to themselves. And when that realization has come, and if he or she has sufficient unselfish love and adaptability to impel a change of habits and the institution of a routine daily practice which will correct the offending factor; then, and only then, may a new start be made, and with more than a fighting chance of success. But after that there must be no more slacking. The psychic trauma may indeed be healed, but deep down in the Unconscious or Subconscious the record is stored away, and if the old discords are again struck, the old wound may reopen.

The following question was recently put to all married women through the medium of a full-page advertisement on the back cover of a famous magazine:

> Would your husband marry you again? . . . Fortunate is the woman who can answer "Yes." But many a woman, if she is honest with herself, is forced to be in doubt—after that she pays stricter attention to her personal attractions.

The words were accompanied by a colored picture of a tête-à-tête between two society people, the woman wearing a modern backless gown which displayed her radiant skin from neck nearly to waist. The writer, psychologist, artist, and business man who collaborated in assembling that advertisement had no higher purpose than to sell soap. As with the other advertisement quoted earlier in this chapter, the business man who paid the enormously high price demanded for it knew that he was making a paying investment by playing on the uneasy fears of numberless women who had neglected their skins after marriage; and he knew also that the question he asked was one which many married men have asked themselves, and some have answered "No."

On the other hand, many men might well reverse the question and ask themselves if their wives would marry *them* again? Yet the supreme egotism of Man would make it unlikely that men ever ask themselves this question. Their assurance is the heritage of Ages of male dominance and supposed superiority over women, and it dies hard. The men who neglect their teeth, their feet, their manners, who smoke stinking pipes at home, and who after marriage discard all the little courtesies and lover-like attentions that mean so much to every woman: what women who deserve equal suffrage would marry *such* men again?

Enough on this subject. If more stress has been laid on negligence of women than of men, it is not because men are less culpable but because Nature itself imposes peculiar power and responsibilities on women which are self-evident. Woman is the sustainer of the home, of the family, and of man's inspiration. Holding such a high place in the scheme of evolution, Woman involuntarily occupies a pedestal, not only in the eyes and hearts of men, but in fact. And like all who are on pedestals, any lapses of hers in what is truly her own Kingdom are more conspicuous and far-reaching than the lapses of men.

# CHAPTER V

## CHRONIC IRRITATION

OFFENSE to the sense of sight is next in order. The neglected shave and unbrushed teeth are early danger signals. So are slovenliness and dowdiness in dress. Most details of personal hygiene should be done in as much privacy as possible. This should be one of the *strictest* rules of marriage. True modesty is essential to the preservation of mutual romantic interest. And yet modesty has no concern with clothing or with nudity. The sight of a beautiful body is always ennobling.

> A human form is divinity in flesh and blood. A well-developed man is a splendid spectacle worth the sight. Every feature of his body, in its bareness, commands the admiration of both sexes. . . . Glorious is woman's figure, an image of living grace and elegance. A nude beauty charms the intellect and

stifles the passions. Her sanctifying appearance elevates the spectator to a high plane of existence.[1]

Modesty, therefore, is a personal or rather individual mode of self-expression, difficult to define, a subtle blending of delicacy and sweetness, of sincerity and refinement, an exquisite and innate understanding of the fitness of things and of conduct.

The sense of sight in some people may be offended by general carelessness in dress, or by specific acts, such as going about the house in deshabille; or by wearing some old and untidy garment, as a faded or frayed out bathrobe or kimono, or an old pair of bedroom slippers. Some women cannot endure seeing their husbands in shirt sleeves. Other women do not mind shirt sleeves, but they draw the line at suspenders.

A man may not like to see his wife's hair mussed up or tousled or in curl papers. Or he may demand that she be always dressed according to what he considers the mode. Thus he would insist on tight corsets, forty-five degree heels, bare arms and furs at 98 in the shade, long kid gloves, and so forth; all non-essentials at their best, some bad, some bad-looking, some only stupid, all of them uncomfortable, and all *unbeautiful* to natural and artistic eyes.

---

[1] Pramatha Nath Dey in *Continence and Sexual Hygiene.*

The problem is not solved, however, by saying that artificial ideals of dress or manners are unreasonable or selfish or non-essential. Of course they are, more or less. But the fact often remains that they have become actual necessities, albeit artificial ones, through early training and environment. They are inextricably bound up with the personal expression and reaction, and however irrational or tyrannical they may be—there they are.

It may be senseless or even cruel for a wife to demand that her husband wear a coat or tuxedo at home when they are dining alone together on a hot night. And yet if her training from infancy has established a fixation which interprets shirt sleeves at table as vulgarity, her involuntary *reaction* to such "vulgarity" at her table would be similar to the reaction of a more naturally trained personality at some exhibition of what meant vulgarity to him or her; say, drunkenness at table, spitting on the floor, or chewing tobacco in church.

In sum, the feelings of an artificially trained man or woman may be as much outraged by a breach of social etiquette, as those of a naturally trained man or woman would be at displays of actual vulgarity.

In these days when American women have learned to smoke after the Continental custom, smoking by men has no longer its exclusive significance. But there remains one form of male smoking that should not be passed over. Some men enjoy pipes. Pipes always impart a stale and persistently disagreeable odor to a room and its contents, and the odor is at once perceived by all who are not pipe users. Some women do not mind pipes, and in their cases there is nothing to be said. But more women detest pipes and only tolerate them because they have to. Excessive tobacco users always claim that smoking has no bad effects. And yet many men who smoke pipes smoke them constantly at home notwithstanding the annoyance to their wives! Such persistence at home in a habit which is objectionable to wives and daughters can only be interpreted as indifference to discomfort caused to others; and such a development is surely a bad effect from any habit!

This effect is evident in a lesser and more unconscious degree even with some cigar smokers. Many women still do not smoke, and some do not like the smell of tobacco. When men are calling at homes they have not visited before, or seldom visited, they often ask the hostess if they may smoke? They have no idea of her tastes, but ask the permission anyway, knowing that she will grant it, either from a sense of hospitality, or because a refusal might offend. How many men who are otherwise gentlemen realize that when they make that request in a strange home they may be embarrassing their hostess, particularly when the request means a pipe? The request is, in effect, a demand!

The frequent display of such callousness by cultured men seems to indicate that the excessive use of tobacco does tend to blunt one's sense of fitness, not to put it more strongly, "for it is the only habit which a gentleman will publicly indulge in when he knows it to be offensive to many."

There is, however, another aspect of excessive tobacco smoking. Pipe smoking at home is sometimes the *result* of chronic irritation in the family life. In the modern psychoanalytic view all bad habits such as alcoholism, drug addiction, and excessive tobacco smoking or chewing, are more or less unconscious efforts to escape from irksome realities. All of them partially anæsthetize emotional responsiveness and take the edge off chronic irritation; they make tiresome realities seem less tiresome by blurring one's perception of them. Some wives, tired out by economic or other stress, seek the nearest outlet for their pent-up irritation and anxiety, and nag their husbands almost continuously. The effects on husbands will depend on their essential natures. One type will tend to lose self-confidence, to develop neurasthenia with secondary disturbances of digestion and nutrition, or to seek relief in the excessive effects of tobacco which only pipes can give—good cigars being as a rule too expensive at that gait. Another type will react by being at home as little as possible and by finding solace with other women.

The very worst way to meet domestic stress is with bad temper. People should do one thing or the other; either stay together and be good sports and make the best of it; or separate and give each another chance for happiness with someone else. At this point they would do well to ask themselves the question put by a priest to a confidant in Basil King's *The Lifted Veil,*—"When you married Leslie was it primarily to be a good wife to him, or to get a good husband for yourself?" In other words, Did you marry to love or to be loved?

Another rather frequent source of irritation is where one may be a fresh-air fiend, and the other—normal. Fresh air addicts think they must have it even with wind, rain, snow, or hail. With such couples the double bed, or even the same bedroom, becomes either a battleground or—for one—a place of torment. With some couples one may like two blankets, and the other only one. In those cases the former is usually quite certain that the latter's health is being ruined by two blankets. In these and in similar instances people should try to realize that marked desires for such things as fresh air or still air, or light or heavy covering, usually indicate actual bodily needs, and that for one to insist that the other follow his practice is unreasonable and cruel, and may even be harmful to that one. When there are such differences in physical temperaments the only sane and fair rule is to live and let live, which means with married people separate beds or separate rooms and no arguments.

One has to live several years in Continental Europe to learn that our American ideas about fresh air in sleeping rooms need revision. I have seen family after family of well-nourished, intelligent and beautiful children who sleep, even in summer, in tightly closed rooms. By our rules such children should be inferiors, but they are not. Results are more convincing than theories, and the *facts* are that Italian children compare favorably with American children in every way. This is medical heresy, but it is time that someone has the courage to say the truth.

I do not wish these remarks to be understood as indorsing closed rooms and stale air for American children. What I do wish to emphasize is that the facts I have cited are true for Southern Italy. I believe that their sane consideration in America might serve to restrain the excessive and indiscriminate application of the fresh air idea to all alike by certain well insulated enthusiasts.

A man may irritate a wife, say, by neglecting to have his trousers creased often enough. Indeed, I know of one case in which this neglect by a husband was found by analysis to be the main factor in a neurosis in the wife. The correctness of the diagnosis was proved by the result of the treatment; namely, that after a friend and psychologist had put the husband wise he began to crease his trousers regularly, and the wife's neurosis disappeared.

In another case a wealthy and talented man insisted on wearing a celluloid collar, even at prominent social affairs, notwithstanding the oft-expressed annoyance and mortification of his wife. This may have been the starting point of troubles that led later to their separation. The man would not or could not change. Mutual irritation grew and grew, extending to other things, until at last it came to the point where he must decide between his wife and his celluloid collar. He decided for the collar.

One might cite similar things *ad libitum*. Whatever they may be, they are one and all instances of small things that strike discordant notes in what should be the married harmony. The irritations caused by most of them do not spring so much from true expressions of personalities as from artificial views which are results of early training. Provided that the prime requisite of personal cleanliness and sweetness is observed, and both parties have in some measure the virtues of unselfishness and adaptability, and above all Love; all such mere educational habits should be easily compromised—but not underestimated.

And yet artificial ideals of what is right or nice or proper may be strong enough to build up impassable barriers to love expression. If irritation in small things is kept up, sooner or later it becomes chronic, and then it passes beyond the things themselves and into all phases of the life together. An analogy from medicine will perhaps make this clearer. Chronic irritation, kept up for a long time, is one of the recognized causes of cancer. Examples are the almost continuous holding of a cigar or a pipe in one corner of the mouth; continuous irritation of the tongue by a carious tooth; the steady pressure of a badly made corset against a woman's breast.

So may chronic irritation in marriage from some insignificant thing develop into a cancer, a malignant growth which undermines and later destroys the union. The lesson which is shouted out by such deplorably common experience is just this: That all wise and unselfish husbands and wives should study each other's little idiosyncrasies, their peculiarly personal and seemingly irrational likes and dislikes, their fancies and phobias. These things often have deep root in the Unconscious—in the so-called love-ideal. Sincere efforts should be made to avoid the little things which irritate, and to encourage those which please. In marriage more than anywhere else there must always be a cheerful readiness to give and take, to live not for one but for two. After unselfishness and common sense, the most essential virtue to be cultivated and lived up to in marriage is—*Adaptability*.

# CHAPTER VI

## FATIGUE

FATIGUE, or lessening of energy output, of efficiency, of functioning power, is an universal property of matter, of instruments, of bodies, even of metals. It is just as inevitable as are any and all of the great alternating phases of nature. Fatigue and pain are the warnings of Nature, its safety valves, for the conservation of the vehicles of life. The law holds rigidly in all human experience. When we are tired physically we cannot work well or rapidly. When we are exhausted we cannot work at all.

For pleasure and even for great joy the same law of alternation always obtains. The most gorgeous scenery, the most ideal human form, will tire any eyes, however artistic and appreciative, at the end of a whole day. The eyes need the repose which night and darkness bring. The most beautiful music cannot be endured for more than four or five hours by even the most trained ears. The ear drums lose their fine tension and elasticity, and the marvelously complex receiving instruments of the inner ears do not respond and coördinate as well. They have vibrated too long and need rest. Yet who would dare to say that the scenery, the human form, and the music, in themselves, had become less beautiful because eyes and ears had lost the power to enjoy?

The most passionate kiss, the most rapturous embrace, could not be conceived of as lasting indefinitely. They might be repeated many times but eventually a time would come with the most ardent lovers when mutual demonstrations of affection would have to cease. The intense desire for intimacy must in time give place to a desire for solitude and privacy.

Aside from the demand of physical bodies for cessation and repose after every kind of exercise and experience, there is a deeper psychological urge for periods of solitude which comes from what is called in psychoanalysis the Unconscious, but what Eastern psychology regards as the Ego or Higher Self. In the mechanism of the higher consciousness there is a process analogous to digestion and assimilation. In this higher process all experiences of desire, emotion, and thought are, as it were, brooded over by the Ego, and whatever is true and good and beautiful in them is assimilated or built into the soul as permanent increments of will, faculty and character. To give a few illustrations: Every experience of personal courage or heroism leaves a permanent gain to the will-aspect of the individual in courage, determination and initiative. Tremendous intellectual efforts, as those of Newton and Einstein, permanently expand the cognitional or intelligence aspect of the individual. Every great and transcendent experience of unselfish love causes a permanent expansion of the feeling-aspect of consciousness, with thereafter a greater capacity for unselfish love and devotion, and some improvement in the emotional nature all around. The same is essentially true of all experiences of ecstacy which come through religion, music, and art.

Finally, the absolute need for periods of solitude, for meditation and self-examination, has been recognized from time immemorial by all religious orders and all other schools which have as their common object the development of spirituality, of character, and of personal power.

The occurrence of temporary mutual loss of interest between people who love each other, or in other words emotional stagnation, has close analogies with two well-known electrical phenomena. The first is the familiar laboratory experiment with pith balls suspended by threads near each other. When one of these bodies is positively electrified and the other negatively electrified they have mutual attraction and move toward each other. The attraction continues indefinitely if they remain near together but are prevented from touching. But when they do contact each other their different electricities are neutralized, mutual attraction ceases, and they fall apart.

Human analogies are obvious. A child has been with its mother all day. Towards the end of the day it becomes peevish and hard to amuse. When the father comes home in the evening the child runs to him for kisses and caresses. He clings to the father a little time, then gradually disengages himself and presently is playing with his toys, or is back again with the mother.

In this example, the mother and child had become saturated with each other's magnetism during the day. There was no more flow or current between them. They were mutually demagnetized. When the father returned home after a day of complete separation he was charged with magnetism of a different quality—at a different level, from that of the wife and child. Hence the automatic demonstration of attraction as well as affection.

Everyone knows, even though he may be reluctant to admit it, that there is generally more fervor, more thrill, in the kiss of welcome after an absence, than in the kiss of good-bye in the morning or some days since.

The other electrical analogy is that of the polarized galvanic battery. The battery in its simplest form consists of two pieces of different metals immersed in an acid or saline solution, which acts chemically on one of the metals. The metal acted upon or corroded is called the positive electrode, and the other the negative electrode. When the two are connected by a wire an electric current is generated. The positive electrode is acted on by the solution, and though the negative electrode is not, its surface soon becomes covered with fine bubbles of hydrogen gas, which is a non-conductor. The current gets weaker and weaker, and at last ceases to flow. When the circuit is interrupted the bubbles of gas soon detach themselves from the surface of the negative electrode, and when the contact is again made, the current again flows.

The human analogy occurs where two people have been continuously together for a long time. One of them has become polarized, insulated, and there is no more current flowing between them. Nothing remains but inertia and stagnation. Each is tired of the other—but only temporarily. If they persist in remaining together, or are unable to get away from each other for a while, the attitude of simple indifference gradually changes into boredom, and boredom later into annoyance. On the other hand, if they separate for a time—hours, days, or weeks, as the particular case may require—the two become depolarized, and once more the mutual attraction state is present. The *physical channel* is reopened, the channel which is the natural pathway, the line of least resistance for the emotion of love to travel by.

Examples of human polarization and demagnetization are often seen in brothers and sisters and other near relatives, slaves of circumstance, who are forced by economic or other considerations to live together closely and continuously. They have to see each other every day and all day, morning, noon, and even night. In modern city life and money stress, room space is at such a premium that it is hardly an exaggeration to say that privacy is a luxury which can only be enjoyed for brief intervals in bathrooms. Under such "civilized" conditions relatives and married people grow to almost hate each other.

One more physical analogy which may be cited is the phenomenon of sympathetic vibration. When two vibrating instruments, such as tuning forks, are keyed to the same pitch; when one is struck and vibrates or sounds out its note, the other will also vibrate in unison, even though at a considerable distance from the one which was struck. If one fork is keyed higher or lower than the other, it will not vibrate when the other is struck.

So it may be with married people or with friends. When the nervous systems of both are vibrating at the same rate of speed, each will respond and thrill to the other. But when one is tired, and therefore vibrating at a lower rate, or is overwrought and vibrating at an abnormally high rate, there is no more response between them until readjustment of their nervous instruments takes place.

Returning once more to the second electrical analogy, which is perhaps the better one, the current of the polarizing battery was found to be too inconstant to be of much practical use. Therefore chemists studied the problem and presently discovered physical and chemical means which could prevent polarization and thus enable a constant current to flow through and from the battery.

In much the same way physiologists and psychologists have studied the corresponding human problem. It is immensely more complicated than the mere physico-chemical one, but it has been analyzed and reduced to its elements. The laws that govern human attraction and repulsion are now understood, and the practical adaptation of domestic life to those laws prevents human polarization, or demagnetism, or unsympathetic vibration.

# CHAPTER VII

## CONVENTIONAL BOGIES

### *Double Beds*

"THE marriage state is holy and the bed is undefiled," says the Good Book. Doubtless, when all that is implied in that phrase is taken into consideration. But as to beds, it is the unanimous opinion of those who know, that the most deadly single enemy to the conservation of romance and of magnetism in marriage is the sacred and time-worn institution, the continuous nightmare, known as the double bed. Let there be no misunderstanding on this point. Apart from honeymoons, the only objection to double beds is their continuous, habitual use, night after night, month after month, by many married people in blind obedience to a custom passed down by our ancestors, who probably had better nerves than their modern descendants. A woman once said to me: "My husband and I were always so devoted to each other that we were never separated a single night since our wedding—except one night when my baby was born." Poor man! I happened to know something about his home life. The wife's fond remark was made on the occasion of his funeral.

In America, the land of new and daring departures, the double bed is being more and more replaced by single beds in the homes of the present generation. Yet even now, especially in small communities, the gossips still give each other thrills when one tells another how "Mrs. So-and-So's servant told my maid that Mr. and Mrs. Somebodyelse occupy separate beds!" The increasing use of single beds in America has sprung from an imperative though perhaps subconscious need of the new race that is developing from the European amalgamation. The most prominent characteristic of that new race thus far is a restless energy. Also there are keen intellect, great adaptability, resourcefulness, and a relatively high standard of family life. This combination indicates highly strung, finely organized nervous systems of a type that may be described as electric. Now people of this vivid ardent type cannot express themselves well in the staid, conventional, hum-drum modes of their ancestors. And therefore to them the marriage of their ancestors, with the sacred obligation of the permanent double bed, became intolerable and a menace to the security of the home. After a period of much unhappiness, unprecedented scandals, and a holocaust of divorces, the American qualities of adaptability and resourcefulness were brought into action on the marriage question, and presently the permanent double bed, the modern marriage juggernaut, began its stubborn retreat into history and the garret, there to rejoin its ancient contemporaries—wigs, hoopskirts, side-saddles, snuff-boxes, commodes, chastity cases, and other things obsolete.

While double beds are of course quite the proper thing when really desired by both parties, it often happens that one may be feeling tired or worried or restless, or perhaps not very well, and would prefer to sleep alone. Unfortunately frankness is often lacking. One may be afraid of hurting the other's feelings, or of seeming indifferent, and for that reason may *endure* the other's presence. In such cases there is never any mutual satisfaction but the reverse.

It is easy to understand how people who are sensitive and loving may try to deceive each other in this way—because they shrink from inflicting pain. If they only understood the elementary laws of physiology and psychology, of physics and chemistry, they would know that the seeming indifference which comes from fatigue or worry or indigestion is not something to be ashamed of or to require excuses. It is as natural and impersonal as that water runs down hill. If both had this knowledge it would be almost inconceivable that either could think of blaming the other, or feel that it was necessary to deceive.

There are many variants of the double bed obsession. Mutually polarized couples think they must invariably go everywhere together, to church together, on week-ends together; in short, that they must not only try to be always hand in hand, but like Siamese twins. Here is an example typical of many. A polarized couple, the woman with repression hysteria, the man with repression and fatigue neurasthenia, both considering divorce for the last three years. They attend church together, evenings together, week-ends together, and occupy a three-quarter bed every night of the year. In another example a pair became polarized at first, but later found the courage to face the facts. They tried twin beds and going in opposite directions for week-ends, and now they are happy and in harmony for the other five days of the week.

### *Family Fixations*

There is something corresponding to herd instinct in many people which takes the form of exaggerated or dog-like devotion to all who are of blood kindred. When strong it is often without discrimination and puts the relatives above the husband, wife or children. Probably it comes from the continental European and Mongolian age-old custom of deferring always to the parents in all domestic affairs; a kind of paternalism, in fact. In China and Japan the mother of the young man always selects his bride for him, even if he has a foreign education and is living in another country, and he always slavishly obeys her mandate. This appears to be one of the few ways in which the women of such countries, where woman is still in subjection, have their innings and dictate to men. The mother of the man also rules the new household if she happens to be in the neighborhood, and the wife submits. In Continental Europe it is still the same in many States, though to a somewhat lesser extent. In Italy, for example, the man's father and mother come first; his brothers, sisters, cousins and aunts second; and his wife a weak third, particularly if she is foreign born. Naturally, in countries where such ideas prevail, the woman is regarded as the man's inferior, and she as a rule passively accepts the situation. To mention a case in point, a beautiful young Italian woman of good family was recently married to a young man personally and financially her inferior, but being a man he was of course her superior in everything else. A girl of her personality, in America, England, or some other Northern countries, could have had almost any man she chose. But being in Italy she had no choice at all, and had to abide by the decision of her own and the young man's parents. During the engagement her future mother-in-law remarked one day: "I intend to take charge of your first child myself." Of course the girl did not like that prospect at all, but there would be nothing for her to do but to lump it, if the elder woman did not change her mind.

In most Northern countries they have got pretty well away from all that now, thank God! But there still survive people of the type that make a kind of fetish of their relatives, deferring to them in many things and making sacrifices for them even at the expense of husband or wife or children. Or they will insist on having a relative or two live in their home, against the wishes of the mate. Now all that is wrong, stupidly wrong, and is certain to lead to serious discord between husband and wife. The ancient prejudice against mothers-in-law is well founded, in the main, and the cases are generally more serious where it is the man's mother. A man can often tolerate his wife's mother, at least for a while, because he is out of the house most of the time. But the unfortunate wife simply cannot get away from her husband's mother all day long. The mother-in-law always feels sure that she could run her son's house and bring up his children much better than the young and inexperienced wife can do; and in some cases it might be true. Even if she has sense enough not to say so—which usually she hasn't—her silent disapproval and the very real pressure of her negative thought will weigh on the wife, affecting her efficiency and destroying her peace of mind. So the only safe and wise and fair rule should be: The home first, relatives after.

### *False Pride and Shyness*

False pride and shyness are frequent barriers to the expression of love, though usually preventable and curable. Let us take a hypothetical case. A normal pair have married and have become polarized from one cause or another. Neither knows anything about the laws of personal relations. Both are sensitive. Not understanding that their coldness is due to, say fatigue from continuous intimacy and their double bed, each thinks the other has ceased to love. Their pride is hurt in the deepest possible way, especially the woman's. Each disdains to make any advance unless the other does, and the result is a suspension of everything but the most important things of all—the continuous intimacy and often the double bed.

Then some providential development causes one to go away for a while. In that interval they both become depolarized and think of each other again with love and longing. When they come together once more, instead of letting Nature take its course, mutual pride and reserve come in. Each remembers the former coldness and the hurt feelings, and waits for the other to make the first move. That is of course largely false pride, wounded vanity, standing on dignity, as you wish to regard it. In other cases pride may be put aside, but in its place there is shyness about taking the initiative. Whether pride or shyness the effect is the same, and while it lasts, the two who should go with joy to each other's arms, stand and wait—a kind of "watchful waiting" as negative there as in the situations that coined the phrase. Unless some sudden shock sends them together before they realize it, the pair continue to keep up their separation within union—even in their double bed. Perhaps not till years later, after they have observed the married lives of others, or have read really helpful books on sex, do they come at last to understand one another and therefore to forgive. But they still stand apart, sullen or sad, or shy and sad, from pride, or from automatism, in the *habit* of heart isolation they have developed from long persistence in a mistaken course.

Yet since there is real love in the hearts of both, there is always the hope and the possibility of reunion, and this time of permanent reunion, because they now have something at least of experience and of knowledge. All that is needed is the shock, the *shell*, perhaps, that will demolish the barriers of reserve that have grown up between them. Or instead of anything comparable to shell-shock, a mutual friend who understands may persuade one to take the first step; and then in the joy of the reunion they realize that it might just as well have been long, long ago, and that all the heartaches and wounds and sullenness and shyness came not from ceasing to love but from complete misunderstanding.

# CHAPTER VIII

## JEALOUSY AND TEARS

THE frequent occurrence of jealousy in friendship, love, and marriage, and the almost universal misconceptions about its significance, warrant a careful psychological analysis of jealousy itself, the conditions in which it develops, and the means for its prevention.

Jealousy is a complex of doubt, fear, humiliation, anger, resentment, and hatred. The first four are introspective states: the last two are extraspective (if I may coin such a word) states, directed towards the person who has aroused the first four. Otherwise stated, jealousy is a reaction consisting of the before-mentioned emotions, or elements, caused by the thought of the transfer of the affections of a person loved to another person. By psychological analysis we find the elements in the following order:

Doubt—of one's capacity to hold the desired affection; fear—of the loss of those affections; humiliation—at the preference shown to another; anger—because deprived of something desired; resentment—towards the person responsible; hatred—the active phase of resentment, directed towards that person and seeking opportunities for revenge.

A desire to hold a person for the sake of the love to be got from that person, is not so much love for that other person as love for self. Or to state it more strongly: Desire to hold possession of another person's body and love, against the preference of that other for someone else, and in disregard of his or her happiness; such a desire is clearly not love for the one desired, but instead a desire to enjoy that one for love of one's own self.

Desire to hold another person in order to keep him or her from others, or so as to be known or spoken of enviously as the one preferred, is unqualified vanity. Consequently, the jealousy complex requires for its foundation a nature in which self-love and vanity are prominent. Jealousy, then, stated in the fewest possible words, is *wounded self-love*, *wounded vanity*, and *confessed inferiority*.

To be wounded is to be weakened. To be jealous is always a sign of loss of confidence and loss of power—loss of power to hold a cherished, or rather *coveted*, possession. The effect of jealousy on the person desired is usually irritating, partly because it to some extent pricks his or her conscience, and because it has the irk of a limitation of one's freedom. During courtship jealousy may occasionally flatter the vanity of a vain person, and in that way give a vicious sort of pleasure. Also, jealousy may sometimes be deliberately incited after marriage, with the idea of strengthening a hold that seems to be relaxing. But as a general rule the occurrence of jealousy in marriage irritates the offending one and swiftly widens the breach.

A little thought will show why this is inevitable. Jealousy is a criticism and a protest against the conduct of the one whose affection or sex interest has strayed, and a demand that such interest be withdrawn from the new object and restored to the former or legal one. The criticism, protest, and demand are often accompanied with reproaches, criticism and ridicule of the person preferred, and—tears! Now however much the criticism may be deserved, it is not welcome; in fact, the more it is deserved, the less it is desired, the more it is resented, and the more it irritates. Irritation is the reverse of interest, especially sex interest.

Another thing. The jealous partner, by showing jealousy, exhibits and admits weakness or loss of attractive power—particularly when in tears—and at the same time expresses, though perhaps mutely, the legal hold which he or she has on the other. That combination of personal weakness and legal strength is not a happy one to emphasize at such a time. Nothing is more futile, more hopeless, than to demand affection as one's *right* when it cannot be *inspired* by one's personality. That is the very quickest way of losing what still remains, and all hope of regaining what has been perhaps only temporarily transferred to another.

We often hear and read the expression, "Jealousy is inseparable from love." Let us examine that proposition. We have shown that ordinary jealousy is nothing but wounded self-love and wounded vanity. Most people have considerable self-love and vanity in them, which are easily touched. Furthermore, jealousy and touchiness are expressions of unconscious recognition of weakness and inferiority. Love, on the contrary, expresses strength and superiority. In the great Oriental philosophy the Creative Power which brought the manifested universe into existence is, in the ultimate analysis, LOVE. If love holds that superlative place in the scheme of evolution, where does jealousy come in?

In the more progressed human minority there remain varying degrees of self-love and vanity, while in those advanced ones whose lives are mainly devoted to the service of others, the vices or weaknesses self-love and vanity are almost outgrown. The amount of jealousy that can be caused in any person will be in direct proportion to the amount of self-love and vanity which are present. In the course of evolution all will gradually learn, by repeated disillusionment, that to work for self is to pursue shadows, and that only by *giving* can we *get* that which is worth having.

A very common delusion among the many delusions which operate as sins against Love, is that tears add to a woman's attractiveness. The older writers of romance drew largely on this for their effective scenes. Their inane heroines invariably wept on every occasion where a display of grief or petulance seemed in order, and whenever the sympathies of men were to be invoked. Modern writers still copy the older ones, and even the great poets—the real seers and divine teachers at times—often fall into the old threadbare delusion.

As a matter of cold and cruel fact in everyday life, people do not look their best, or more appealing, when crying, even when they happen to be beautiful women, and nobody really believes that they do. Divested of all the glamour of romance and poetry, grief, misery, and pity, crying is a complex of red and swollen eyelids, red and swollen and snuffling noses, and blotchy cheeks. These may very well excite pity, if the occasion justifies it, but certainly not admiration.

Every woman should realize that although before her marriage her tears may have *seemed* to have been a powerful lever for playing on her fiancé's sympathies and his desire to please her, the case is entirely different after marriage. Before marriage there were the frequent but comparatively short hours together, alternated with longer separations; their incomplete knowledge of each other, and the usual uncertainties, mysteries, expectations, and illusions of sex. But after marriage those factors, as a sad rule, soon disappear. Each appears before the other as he (or she) actually is, without camouflage, in all their good points and imperfections, literally naked and—unashamed. The deadly convention of continuous intimacy, day and night, has contributed its powerful quota to the general disillusionment, and by banishing all reserve and privacy has smothered almost every thrill of romance and nearly all mutual respect and self-respect. Polarization is complete and the electric circuit is interrupted. Whatever of self-control they may have had before marriage, in the efforts to show each other only their best, is now abandoned. Selfishness, carelessness, and bad temper are given free rein. When the woman falls back on crying, she finds that it calls out only annoyance, perhaps even disgust. Each despises in the other every sign of lack of self-control; and crying is surely a sign of that, even though commonly regarded as a privilege of women and children. Hence the polarized husband's disgust.

What may be called spurious forms of jealousy are often seen in instances where the man and wife have long ceased to find romantic or sex interest in each other. One of them strikes up a friendship with someone else, and then the partner becomes jealous. The jealousy may show in several ways; as a kind of dog-in-the-manger attitude which resents that anyone else should enjoy what he or she does not or cannot; as pique, humiliation or wounded vanity because another is preferred; or a mere conventional reaction that it is the proper thing to be jealous if one's mate cares ever so little for someone else; or again—and even more important—if it is thought that people *may* think or say that such is the case! That is jealousy "à la mode." In a case in point a permanently indifferent husband found an unknown man's picture in his wife's bureau, and then succeeded in working himself up to such a pitch of conventional fury that he talked about blood and "unwritten law."

From the limitless viewpoint of unselfish love, jealousy is an anachronism. Instead of being "inseparable from love," jealousy is incompatible with love, being, as it is, the negation of love.

Keeping in mind that love depends on inspiration, we realize the monumental absurdity of lawsuits for alienation of affections. If affection is really alienated, that is, permanently transferred to another, it means that another has greater power of inspiration than the marriage partner. That greater power may be only relative, depending on temporary inferiority of the partner. In all such cases it is up to neglected partners to take stock of their present equipment of personal attractiveness and to ascertain whether they have slacked off since marriage. If so, they should correct the deficiency and see what happens. *But do not show jealousy*. To be loved, one must be lovable, and to be jealous is to be irritating and unlovable. To sue another person for alienation of affections is to proclaim one's own inferiority in power to inspire. It would be just as consistent, and far more honest, to sue someone for the offense of being more beautiful than oneself because the Declaration of Independence says that all are created equal.

Legal procedure in this matter is so amazingly lacking in the simplest considerations of psychology, that we are forced to conclude that *other* considerations are responsible for its preposterous and unsatisfactory state. Law is made by lawyers. This is true even of the Common Law, which is simply the accumulated decisions of judges, who themselves are only lawyers higher up. As selfish abuse of power is still the rule in our world, and as the law is the expression of power and authority; so it comes about that those who make law are often dominated by selfish motives. In the fewest words, it follows that much of the civil law and its administration that we are cursed with is made *by* lawyers and *for* lawyers.

Suits for alienation of affections, be it noted, are seldom brought unless the persons sued are wealthy, objects of possible plunder for jealous and confessed inferiors or blackmailers, and of *certain* plunder for dishonest lawyers on *both* sides of the cases. No matter which side loses, the lawyers always win.

Hence the discouraging fact that our legal system provides that a person (of wealth) may be sued for being more attractive than a jealous inferior, is not so remarkable after all. There is method in this apparently mad or brainless legal arrangement.

# CHAPTER IX

## VARIETY OF INTERESTS

WHERE people have any kind of work in common they usually find each other somewhat interesting. The same is true of amusements in common, or conversation, or thought. To have mutual interest there must always be a kind of medium of exchange, something in which co-operation can take place. As soon as the work or other factor stops or ceases to function, mutual interest ceases also, in that particular field. But if after working together two people can enjoy similar amusements together, their mutual interest does not cease but is transferred to another field. If those two can also find pleasure in exchanging ideas on abstract subjects, they will then have a community of interests during a large part of their time. Add to these personal physical harmony, and in each some capacity for self-sacrifice, and there exist all the elements on which permanent friendship can be built. Add to all these difference in sex, and there are present the conditions in which the romance and poetry of life can and indeed must inevitably show forth. Happy indeed are the friends, and especially the men and women, who have so much in common and whom Fate brings together!

Variety *is* the spice of life. A famous line says "Who shall exhaust her infinite variety?" The poetic line expresses the elemental desire of all men toward women. The ideal woman of the ordinary world's desire is a radiant creature of changeless beauty but infinitely changeable in all else, a kaleidoscope of moods and expressions.

But that alluring creature of man's desire is after all a rather frothy conception, a counterfeit, but like all counterfeits an immitation of something genuine and precious. The imitation ideal woman is a sequence of desire-emotion reactions, illusory, shifting, impermanent, arising in caprice, sensation, and selfishness. The genuine and permanent variety in a personality rests on the things that count and endure. Such variety expresses the various *capacities* or modes of expression of a personality. In sum, the variety of the illusory personality is the expression of numerous moods, desires, and impulses; while the variety of the permanent individuality expresses so many capacities or faculties—an immense difference.

There is a very important consideration in regard to subjects of common interest in (1) friendship, and (2) marriage. A very real friendship can develop on a basis of a single common interest. The other interests which the friend has do not have to obtrude on or conflict with the common interest. The friends separate during the times when those other interests are being enjoyed, and the enjoyment usually takes place in association with other friends. In fact the time together which is spent by friends who have only *one* interest in common is usually a very small part of their total time. When they have for the time being exhausted the one field of common interest they separate amicably, or even with relief. The two mutually and intuitively know when it is time to part, and there being no conventional rule impelling them to remain longer, they part friends, with hopes of further good times together. Each then goes his or her own way, seeking either privacy, repose, or other friends whom each can enjoy in a new field which the friend just parted from could not enjoy or take part in.

From the foregoing résumé of friendship, one supreme fact emerges. Most people of the educated classes have two or more sides to their personalities. Those sides have as many separate interests. Now we all know that however much one may be interested in a thing or a subject, that interest is enhanced by sharing it with another person. More than that, any deep interest craves or demands comradeship. As said before, in a case of ideal friendship both are able to enjoy, to co-operate, in many interests. But even in the most complete friendships of that kind, one or both are likely to have still other interests, and perhaps very dear interests, in which the other cannot share. Naturally, therefore, such special and intimate interests may be shared with some other persons, even though those others do not enter the wider circle of friendship.

The laws governing friendship apply also in marriage, the legal sex-relation notwithstanding. The latter naturally holds a prominent place in the marriage complex, before and for a time after marriage. But almost inevitably a time comes when mere difference in sex can no longer maintain mutual interest to the exclusion of other strong interests. And in strict accordance with the law of alternation the maintainance of mutual sex interest absolutely depends on a succession of periods of mutual interest in other subjects. Active sex interest means consciousness at high rates of vibration, and emotions under pressure. Universal experience teaches that such tense moods cannot be maintained for a long time. The same is true for enjoyment of scenery, drama, music, oratory. If persisted in after the interest begins to lag, interest is soon succeeded by boredom, and finally by pain. A more crude analogy exists in desire for food. No desire or aspiration is so compelling as the desire for food when one is healthily and ravenously hungry, as after a long day in the woods without anything to eat. Yet that desire is very soon satisfied. If after that point has been reached more food is taken, the keen enjoyment of a short time ago gives place to dislike, and even to nausea. The degenerate Romans, in their lust for physical sensation, sought to make keen appetites continuous by the expedient of vomiting at certain stages of their banquets. The practice soon brought its punishment—or rather reaction—in serious disturbance of and later loss of digestive function.

So with abuse of sexual partnerships. The former delight is followed first by boredom, then disgust, then hatred, and finally even loss of function.

These, then, are the lamentable results that follow exhaustion and overworking of one medium of exchange between two people, with no alternating medium in which they both could transfer their interest for a time. It is the more lamentable because such results are preventable by means of knowledge easy to acquire, and by common sense.

We will now try to apply the principles that underlie successful friendship to marriage. Friends, no matter how many interests they may enjoy in common, separate when they are tired of each other. After a period of separation, long or short as may suit them, they come together again for another experience of mutual pleasure and benefit, and separate once more. Each time they come together they have the joy of physical nearness, the mutual satisfaction of co-operation either in work or exchange of ideas or diversions, and then the—shall we say it?—the mutual relief of separation. The success of this cycle is proven by the continuity of the friendship. Furthermore, each friend has his or her other friends, with whom each, in the interim, may share other interests.

Essential human nature does not change with marriage. Interest or boredom in marriage, as in friendship, are moods resulting from conditions that should be within easy control, if people would only have the sense to apply to their married life the obvious lessons taught by courtship in all ages, and even by many illicit unions. In courtship there are the eagerly anticipated meetings, the evenings and holidays spent together, kisses and caresses, the partings every night, and the looked-forward-to meeting next day. In marriage there are all these, plus the complete sexual intimacy, and minus the partings every night. Where then does the usual disillusionment come in? Many will say through the unrestrained sexual licence. That may be true for some cases, but not for the majority. Note the numerous illicit unions which continue happily—or at any rate with mutual satisfaction and undoubted sex interest—for many years, and not infrequently end in marriage. The procedure in those unions resembles that of courtship more than of marriage. There is in addition the complete sexual union, which as a rule is absent in courtship. But—and observe the BUT—there are frequent partings as in courtship, and *frequent nightly separations.*

In sum, then, we have the following facts:

1. In courtship romantic or sex interest is retained.

2. In illicit unions romantic or sex interest is retained.

3. In marriage romantic or sex interest is often lost.

4. In marriage there is one new and prominent factor which is absent in courtship and in illicit love—*continuous intimacy*.

The logical inference from a comparison of the foregoing facts is plain. The sexual indifference and resulting unhappiness that so often occur in marriage are largely due to the *continuous intimacy* that is forced upon husband and wife by conventional views on marriage and economic necessity.

# CHAPTER X

## LOVE AND BEAUTY

THE contemplation of the beautiful in Nature and in Art calls forth a response which differs in degree and in quality in different persons, but which has one thing in common, namely, pleasure or enjoyment. This may vary in degree from mild interest to passionate enthusiasm; and in quality, on the blend of intellect and feeling involved. The Indian psychologist, Bhagavan Das, calls this reaction the "emotion of beauty." Then he analyzes the emotion inspired by beauty, and finally reduces it, simply and definitely, to the emotion of Love. The presence of beauty, therefore, in any form,—the *action* of beauty—inspires, or rather evokes, a *reaction* of love. This is exceedingly significant as to the essential value of beauty as a creator of love, and of the position it takes in friendship, affection, and marriage.

No attempt will be made here to specifically define beauty, for the perception and conception of beauty are largely individual reactions, and therefore vary as infinitely as do individuals. However, a practical and flexible definition, what may be called a working definition of beauty, can be ventured without stultifying the first words of this paragraph. Beauty, then, in man, woman, or child, is an harmonious combination of curves and color, and of stimuli to the other senses besides sight, which imparts to a given beholder a feeling of agreeableness; which, depending on its degree, is either pleasure, enjoyment, delight, or ecstacy—all being grades of the emotion of *love*.

The reaction in a beholder, to what conforms more or less to his or her concept of beauty, is involuntary, irrespective to the degree or intensity of the reaction. The reaction is naturally greater in intensity when there is difference in sex. When one or both happen to be married to other persons, the reaction is just the same. There is no more wrong attached to such a natural response between man and woman than there is when flint and steel strike fire. Wrong comes in only when one or both yield to selfish considerations to such an extent that they bring suffering to others whose lives are linked with their own. The weak yield; the strong do not; and again as to wrongdoing, in the magnificent and living conception of Eastern philosophy, weakness and strength are expressions of soul *experience*, of duration of individual evolution.

Let it be assumed, then, (1) that beauty in one person, when it corresponds with another's concept of beauty, inevitably and automatically draws forth or *evokes* from the other a feeling of interest and attraction, the intensity of which depends on the extent to which that concept is realized. (2) Difference in sex emphasizes the feeling or response evoked, and adds also an element of desire, evanescent or enduring, depending on the intensity of the response or reaction elicited. (3) Beauty (always the individual concept) is Nature's most essential element in causing men and women to seek union and marriage. (4) When beauty is conserved and reverenced as a divine thing, it remains a solid foundation for enduring love and happiness in marriage. Only in this way is it true in marriage that "a thing of beauty is a joy forever."

The foregoing assumptions lead to the very important consideration as to what things are essential for married happiness, aside from merely physical necessities, such as money. Many young people rush into marriage almost wholly under the glamour of sex attraction. When they are what may be called normal young persons, whose first ardent sex interest in each other is later on transferred to the coming child, such a marriage has excellent prospects for continued happiness, because it provides always a common interest and is operating as Nature intended of marriage.

On the other side, people who marry from sex motives mostly, who do not have children, and who do not engage in any coöperative work, intellectual or philanthropic, soon come to what may be called the negative phase of sex attraction. Their lack of anything else in common, their mutual imperfections, and even lack of personal beauty, become evident when the alluring veils of sex glamour are torn away or worn out.

In contrast with these two classes of people who blindly plunge into marriage there is a steadily increasing class who have education and will power enough to bring to bear some measure of reason and common sense when they are considering marriage. It is only for such people that a book like this may be helpful. Others will read it with more or less passing interest—because it deals with sex—but they will forget all about it when psychological moments arrive.

As love and beauty are inseparable, it follows that beauty is essential to happiness in marriage—it being always understood that by beauty is meant that which appears beautiful to a given individual. As every cultured person usually has an ideal of what to him or her is beauty—even though that ideal may be rather vague—and as that ideal always looms in the vision of the future union with another; it is clear that if for any reason they marry persons who do not to some extent express that ideal, the marriage will soon fall short of what was longed for, and is likely to degenerate into a dreary, lifeless affair. (For the moment only physical beauty is under consideration.) Therefore it would be well if the people who believe they have ideals in their minds of the kind of physical beauty to be desired in their future mates,—it would be well if they gave it definite thought, and then reached conclusions one way or the other; either shaping the ideal in some amount of detail; or, if on examination the ideal cannot be well defined, to discard it and leave everything to Fate or chance.

People of the first instance—those who find that they have definite ideals of physical beauty—should endeavor to hold their ideals constantly available for comparisons, and should not allow themselves to marry persons whose output of beauty is distinctly inferior to their ideals.

Some persons have ideals of physical beauty which demand perfection of certain parts of the body. One man may be particularly attracted by a beautiful face, another by beauty of form. But the ideal may and often does lay particular stress on beauty of one or several parts of the body. Thus to a man it may be a straight or retroussé nose or shell-like ears; small or slender hands or feet; beauty of arms and shoulders, or of ankles, legs or hips; a slender or a Milo waist; large or small breasts; a faultless back; a clear skin, golden or black hair; and so on. Or it may be some mode of self-expression, as a sweet voice or a graceful walk.

The individual interests that delight in beauty of certain parts of the body of the beloved one are designated by scientific writers on sexology as Fetishes. The word has a most unromantic sound in relation to love expression, and also an unpleasant connotation as of barbarous or superstitious practices, or Tantric or Voodoo ceremonies. But the importance of the fetish ideal as a factor in married happiness is frankly admitted by psychologists. To quote one of them, "When the various fetishes which attract a man are found in one woman, let us say, red hair, dark eyes, and a slender build, we have the foundations for a passionate and durable love."[1]

In all such cases where a physical ideal means much to a man or to a woman, it is probably an indication of a real want or need in their essential natures. And therefore it should not be disregarded when they marry. When one's nature joys in beauty, where one's thoughts dwell on the beautiful, it means that one's love nature finds its natural and true response and expression in a mate whose personality expresses beauty in a form or combination that is in some measure complementary. Consequently, when such natures are linked with others whom they afterwards find are not their physical complements, they are unable to give them spontaneous or true love responses.

There is no fault or culpability in either.

---

[1] André Tridon in *Psychoanalysis, Sleep and Dreams*, p. 146.

The pair do not make a durable reciprocating combination, that is all. If they succeed in reaching some harmonic adjustment, it must necessarily be based on other conditions of mutual interest, well enough as far as they go, but a sorry substitute for romance. If there is a child or children, on whom the love energy may be lavished, this, with some will power and with slight temptation, may hold the thoughts and interest in the home circle until advancing age diminishes the sex urge. But otherwise, if someone else is met whose personality meets the deep inner need, a response will go out to that other. If one's sense of duty or of convention is strong enough, the outward expression of the new love response may be withheld, but the feeling and the thought are not. We do not blame water because it runs downhill, even though that property of water occasionally works to our disadvantage. Neither should we blame or censure men and women when their love force goes out to those who are their natural affinities, whatever may be their social bonds. The flow of water and the flow of love obey the same physical law; they seek their level along lines of least resistance. They are neither good nor evil, but phenomena of Nature. The element of wrong only comes in when two people *yield* to the *physical expression* of their natural desires to an extent that causes unhappiness or injury to those they are under moral and legal obligations to protect.

When married partners come to realize that both may have sides to their natures on which they two cannot meet, but on which others of opposite sex *can* meet them, they should then be ready for the further realization that sane and enduring happiness in marriage is not incompatible with other minor heart attachments, the "lesser loves" that Edward Carpenter speaks of, subsidiary to the husband or wife, but ministering to certain essential needs which they cannot reach.

Such an attitude is almost a guaranty that a marriage will be happy. It excludes the demon of jealousy by not demanding absolute and often impossible possession of love interest.

By providing for those *partial* alternations of love interests it prevents polarization, and in doing that goes a long way towards assuring permanence of the greater love which unites man and wife.

**ONE CONTINUING TO LOVE; THE OTHER CEASING TO LOVE.** This may have several explanations. In the first place there is the fundamental proposition: That love only ceases to manifest (1) when its inspiration ceases; (2) when its vehicle is in a state of fatigue; (3) after a psychic shock; (4) when transferred to another object. First to be considered is the *quality* of the love of the one who continues to love; whether it is true outgoing love, or counterfeit acquisitive love, which is not so much love as selfish desire. In the last instance there is always desire to receive, always demand for more, and hardly any given out. Such selfish desire gives little thought to the other except as a supplier of pleasure. Yet even in unselfish love there is apt to be resentment at any lack of inclination to respond when the other happens to be tired or thinking about something else at the moment when what he or she could give is desired. Demands made during times of temporary fatigue and indifference would impel the less selfish one to make an effort to respond and deliver what was wanted. But when *effort* comes into love play, it is time to stop. The effort to respond means that for the time being there is no response to give, and that a substitute is being attempted. But the substitute is soon detected, and then comes heartache and wounded pride. The occurrence of even one such an experience is a shock to the pair, especially to the more truly sensitive one. The lack of enthusiasm and of power to respond when demanded will tend to instill lack of confidence in one's self, particularly if it be the man. When that negative idea comes to a sensitive nature it often develops out of all proportion, and may even render one incapable of further responses to that other one. Polarization is then present.

On the other hand, if the one, who for the moment craved demonstrative love, really and unselfishly loved, and had knowledge, the intuition of true love would be likely to sense that the beloved one was tired or preoccupied and would then at once and spontaneously turn the love current from desire for personal thrills into desire to give help or rest, even if that meant leaving the other entirely alone for the time being.

Psychic shock and transference of love are taken up in detail elsewhere, also some further consideration of cessation of inspiration and of fatigue. To summarize, where one continues to love and the other ceases to love, there may be:

1. Loss of power in the former to inspire, due often to negligence of personal attractiveness, irritating conduct, or other forms of selfishness.

2. Polarization in the latter from fatigue, the fatigue having at least five possible sources: (a) Exhaustion of the one common interest; (b) Obscuration of all other interests due to continuous intimacy plus double beds; (c) Being forced to live with tiresome relatives; (d) Economic stress and anxiety; (e) Sickness.

3. Psychic shock from some incident of conduct or expression which revolted or disgusted one of the pair.

4. Transference of interest to another whose personality seems to conform more to the ideal of the mate, or to the fetishes of the ideal.

The one, who first notices the lack of interest in the other, must be the one to act—to use finesse; as it were, to play the other with a long line. It is suggested that women should be mindful of the two following points: (1) The woman, more than the man, is apt to cling closer, when she senses a slight cooling off of interest; and therefore it will be rather harder for her to use the advice just given. (2) Women, more generally than men, have preconceived notions of what love and marriage will be like, derived largely from the false and imaginary standards of popular novels. Therefore many women undoubtedly fall in love with Love, rather than with a particular man.

# CHAPTER XI

## RIGHTS AND REALITIES

The ceremony of marriage, or rather the contract, confers certain legal rights for mutual protection and for the protection of children. In most civilized States at the present time such rights or safeguards are in the main commendable. But it was different in times not so long passed, when woman was yet under male subjection, and when the laws made by men were made almost exclusively *for* men and the satisfaction of their desires. The old list of marital "rights" contained some items so amazingly stupid and brutal in our modern view as to seem incredible. Lest we forget, let us mention a few of them. The man then had absolute legal right to the wife's *body* at all times, with or without her consent, and whether he was well or diseased, sober or drunk. A man had the legal right to any money and property of his wife, and to any money she might earn during intervals when he had deserted her and their children. A man had the legal right to will his *unborn* child to any person he chose. A drunken or diseased man could actually summon police aid to force a "disobedient" wife to share his *bed*, if she resisted his commands to that extent. And so on.

The memories of such gross legal tyranny are like bad dreams now, and the fact that they were grim realities hardly one generation ago, and in the most enlightened countries, is one of the surest signs of the spiritual progress we are making, and of the rapid development of what Jane Addams calls community conscience.

The modern marriage contract usually includes, in addition to the archaic promise of the wife to obey the husband, a mutual promise or obligation to love and honor each other until they are parted by Death. The exaction of such promises implies the belief that emotions of love and of honor towards certain persons can be perpetuated by means of promises. Such assumptions show profound ignorance of psychology. The emotions of love, honor, reverence, gratitude, etc., are not matters of will or obligation, of deliberation or decision, but of *inspiration;* and the inspiration comes only from the presence in a person of the qualities or attributes which call forth or *evoke* such feelings. Hence a promise to love and honor someone can hold only as long as the inspiration to love and honor endures. It is true, of course, that some persons have so prominent in them the capacity for understanding and compassion that their general attitude is one of love toward all beings—the Christ-like attitude, in fact. To them "there are no rights but only duties." They recognize in all, even in the most undeveloped, the spark of the Divine Life which is common to all and is the basis of sympathy and brotherhood; and they know that that Spark will burn always brighter as the dross of the lesser self is consumed. But this wider capacity for loving is as yet developed in comparatively few. The rest of us are still dependent on definite kinds of inspiration for the expression of feelings of love, not to mention honor. Hence it is not only bad psychology but stupidly unfair to require people at our level to love and honor someone until death or any other time. If the inspiration lasts, very well. But if it does not, then the promise cannot be kept.

The answer to the burning question: "How can I retain the love, the lover-like interest, of the one whose love I have, or had, and long to hold?" is found in the single word *inspiration*. The details will vary in every case, but the following suggestions may be helpful:

(1) Retain, conserve, and wisely use those qualities or attributes in yourself which first attracted your lover.

(2) Cut out any personal habits or mannerisms of your own which you have found bore or irritate your lover. You can easily detect and restrain them if you have sense and intuition and enough courage to look them in the face.

(3) Never relax as to at least *some* amount of privacy; nor as to the most scrupulous attention to personal attractiveness and personal hygiene. "Cleanliness is next to Godliness."

(4) Try to be interested in and companionable to your lover in whatever he or she enjoys. You can usually do this without much effort, if you really love.

(5) Never reproach or complain of coldness or lack of enthusiasm and never demand attention or affection or, in plain language, sex-interest. That can never be had on demand but only by inspiration. To demand it only pushes it farther away.

(6) Be a dynamic center of personal attraction which can inspire interest and love from the opposite sex. You were that before, and if you are not now, it must be mostly your own fault. You know that when you were such a center you expressed, certainly in some degree, health, beauty, refinement, intelligence and adaptability. To these you should add, if you did not before, unselfishness and sincerity.

(7) Love for what you can *give*, and do not think of what you may *get*. If you really give out love, sincere, unselfish love, it will return to you as surely as the swing of the pendulum. Said a great Teacher: "The man who renounces love will find it pouring back upon him in another form." Said another: "Of all the Qualifications, Love is the most important, for if it is strong enough in a man, it forces him to acquire all the rest, and all the rest without it would never be sufficient." And the greatest of all Teachers said: "Cast your bread on the waters and it will return to you after many days."

(8) With the aid of the greater experience and wisdom and love that you now have, strive always to perpetuate as far as practicable the conditions which existed before marriage, in which romantic love was continuously present.

(9) Realize that all developed personalities have many facets, many interests, many modes of self-expression; and that you may not be able to meet your beloved in *all* his or her

interests. Therefore do not stand in the way of his or her enjoyment with someone else of that which you are not interested in; and also use the same privilege for yourself in any deep interest which your mate cannot share with you, and which another can.

FUNDAMENTAL DIFFERENCES IN SEX EXPRESSION. Equality of the sexes—physical and mental, legal and political—is now conceded in all truly civilized countries. But for all that, human nature remains essentially the same. In the eternal sex play between man and woman certain modes of expression do not change. The man ever seeks the woman, and the woman ever attracts and waits for the man. This is the foundation of all romance. No amount of sex emancipation or sex equality can change the age-old method, and at the same time conserve romance. The most emancipated women, when physically normal, are usually the most essentially and delightfully feminine, and they abhor the idea of taking the obvious initiative in love. A high-grade and normal man may find his vanity flattered if sought or pursued by women, but when it comes to marrying he usually prefers to do the courting himself. "Figure to yourself, O man, a courtship absolutely undenied, from the first accepted, even encouraged, with complaisantly unresisting bride . . . ! How awfully dull! Does not the stoutest heart quail at the suggestion?" That is the way Edward Carpenter feels about it. (*The Drama of Love and Death*, page 42.)

Reverting to first principles, then, woman's part in romance is that of a center of attraction, a magnet. To be consistent with that fact she cannot ask for the sex interest of men, but she may and can inspire it. The power to succeed in love, or rather to obtain the love of the person desired, is probably about equal in the sexes. The man's initiative and freedom of choice is at least balanced by the woman's magnetic attraction, and, in civilized countries, her physical freedom of choice. Thus in the end a woman has about the same chance of getting the man she wants, as a man has of winning the woman he desires

—even though he can ask, while she can only attract and wait to be asked.

In the deepest nature of things, then, the power to conserve romance after marriage is vested in the woman more than in the man. When both are relatively normal physically, mentally, and emotionally, the cause for any waning of the man's romantic love or sex interest (the two are identical) probably lies not so much in masculine fickleness or promiscuity as in the wife's slacking off in her efforts to be as attractive as possible. To be sure, her task is somewhat harder as a wife than as a sweetheart. Her mystery is gone now, and she has to depend for her continued attractiveness on what she actually and intrinsically *is*. But "a thing of beauty is a joy forever," not merely poetically but literally, provided it is wisely conserved and not dulled and cheapened by neglect and obtuseness and the over-familiarity which may bring contempt. Discrimination and vigilance are incumbent on wives who would retain their husbands' romantic interest. And it cannot be too often reiterated that the surest way in which that can be done is by maintaining a high standard of personal attractiveness. If they succeed in this, their husbands will then be inspired to do likewise, and such pairs, as married lovers, will have realized "the world's desire."

Some very noble women will say that this is bringing love down to a merely physical basis. So it is. But Nature, not man, has decreed it thus. Every kind of action and reaction must spring from and to a solid physical platform. Likewise the reaction of love must respond to the presence of *beauty* in a human *physical* body; and beauty in this sense means health and harmony. Remember also that although a man may inspire a woman and bring out the best that is in her, it is nevertheless true and Nature's way that inspiration usually begins and ends in the woman.

A husband's fancies or affinities for other women may develop merely because he finds in them, or thinks he does, the attraction which his wife formerly had. If the wife's present lack of attractiveness to him is due to her own neglect to maintain the high degree of personal magnetism and sweetness which brought him to her, then probably the fault is not so much his as hers. If she realizes this in time, and if his attitude toward her is merely one of passive and polarized indifference and not of active disillusionment from some psychic shock or trauma, the wife may then recover the ground she has lost by restoring the conditions *in herself* which existed prior to marriage. In other words, she should try to make herself as attractive or more attractive than her rival. She has more than even chances of regaining her former position if she goes about it in this way. But she has no chance at all if she tries tears, reproaches, demands that he give up interest in the other woman, or catty criticism of her.

There are several reasons why a wife's chances of regaining and reholding her husband's heart interest are greater than those of an affinity. First, there is the fact that their love resulted in marriage, which suggests that they have a strong bond of real sympathy between them, something that might become temporarily relaxed but could not easily be broken.

Secondly, being already a wife in legal bonds, whom he had promised to love and cherish, is a strong appeal to the better nature of a true man, and also to his honor as a gentleman.

Thirdly, the wife's personal attractiveness is not lost but temporarily obscured, more or less from her own carelessness and neglect. After so severe a lesson she is not likely to drift into the same negligence again.

Fourthly, the husband's lapse was not so much transference of his deep heart interest as a compensatory emotional outlet. The wife's personal negligence had so polarized her that she was for the time being no longer a channel or magnet or inspiration for emotions of love and beauty. Hence when the husband met a radiant woman who could inspire him, his damned-up emotions involuntarily responded to her in a lover-like way. And thus a meeting, which normally would have inspired merely admiration, now inspires a love affair.

Fifthly, every *successful* wife has as part of her equipment a certain amount of *finesse.* By finesse I do not mean in the smallest degree deception, which is the connotation the word has to many people, but a kind of super-tact or adaptability, or perhaps better still, a *graciousness*, which tells her just what to do at every time and place, and just how to do it. Its practical aspect is that women who have it have far greater power to hold men's interest than women who lack it, even though the latter may be quite as good looking or more so, and also perhaps superior and nobler.

What was said in the last paragraph is not intended to put finesse above frankness. Both are modes of expression, virtues to be cultivated, but their good use requires discrimination. Frankness without discrimination may be inept, stupid, or cruel. Finesse avoids all that, but on certain occasions where frankness in indicated its use then becomes a part of finesse. Finesse never wounds, irritates, or jars. Frankness often does, particularly when used in criticism or to tell people of their faults. Practically the distinction comes to this: When two courses of right action are open to us, we should endeavor to choose the one which best promotes peace, harmony, and happiness for all concerned.

In the July, 1921, number of *Photo-Play Magazine* there is an interview with Rupert Hughes, having the startling title, "Is Marriage a Bunco Game?" After severely scoring the usual procedure in courtship, which is to hide all defects and incompatibilities and show only the best side of each lover, Mr. Hughes summarizes his ideas thus: "Let courtship become a period not of rosy deceit but of honest trial acquaintance." No one can ignore the common sense in that statement. But there is another and perhaps wider view of the whole situation that may be worth looking at.

It is admitted, of course, that no one is always agreeable, always good-tempered, always magnetic or always inspiring. We all have our lapses, our irritating faults, moods, and mannerisms. During courtship we manage to conceal most of that; we do not obtrude our unattractive phases on our friends or lovers or sweethearts. And the universal experience is that as long as we succeed in *not* obtruding those phases, *we are happy and we give happiness!* Is there not a practical and wholesome lesson in those results? Let us see.

If "the purpose of philosophy is the end of pain," then to achieve happiness is going a long way in that direction. Happiness that is mutual, and deprives no one else, cannot be otherwise than good. And therefore the practical lesson from courtship is: Not to obtrude our faults on our husbands or wives; not to show them all our defects; not to tell them of all our past bad or foolish actions; in short, not to get too well acquainted as to our lower natures after marriage.

So when nothing but good results from it, why not do our best to keep up the innocent camouflage that hides what is still disagreeable in us? People make the efforts and succeed and are happy before marriage. Why not try to keep up a *permanent* concealment of our defects from our loved ones, and thus keep between us a permanent attractiveness? There is no more obligation to show our worst side after marriage than before; nor to tell other people what we think are their faults.

Of course I do not mean for an instant that anyone has a moral right to conceal from the future mate some definite mental or physical defect, such as hereditary insanity or mental defect, or physical malformation or disease; that would be unpardonable. I mean only such unlovable phases of our emotional natures as we have not yet brought under control, but hope to some day.

There is no actual deceit in such an attitude; but merely determination not to yield to negative impulses of our lower natures in presence of our loved ones, and therefore the establishment of high standards of conduct that shall be permanent. We succeeded in suppressing our disagreeable impulses during courtship; or rather we in large part *transmuted* them into higher forms of energy We can continue the process during marriage, and though it may be harder because more time is spent together, the *habit* of agreeableness can be consciously kept up until it becomes automatic, and therefore established.

It will be helpful to keep in mind that the disagreeable expressions of our personalities are *not* deep emotional urges which need outlets, but mostly bad habits of conduct, automatic reactions developed largely through faulty training in childhood. Consequently their repeated suppression by the will does not drive them back into the Unconscious but eventually kills them out. So much stronger in Nature is the evolutionary urge towards good that all bad habits cease to function if their expressions are restrained for a certain time. The reform processes are greatly accelerated if the expedient of transmutation is used, and good habits deliberately substituted for bad ones.

## CHAPTER XII

### CONTINENCE AND FIDELITY

Most writers on sexology, when discussing continence, confine themselves to its anatomical and physiological aspects. It will be considered herein mostly from the standpoint of its psychology.

The psychology of the general medical attitude toward continence is interesting mainly because of its contrasts. In discussing the subject with young or well-preserved medical men of middle age I have found the concensus of opinion to be that strict continence is abnormal, and therefore sometimes harmful. On the other hand, middle-aged and elderly physicians, including authorities on sex and sanitation, decide that sexual indulgence is not necessary to health, and therefore that continence is entirely feasible and merely a matter of will power. Also, in their view, sexual indulgence outside of marriage being unnecessary to health, and having in it danger of infection and of illegitimate offspring, is a menace to public health and public morality, and therefore should be condemned as perverse and selfish. Such are the general verdicts of the two medical groups.

The difference in opinion held by each group of medical men, the younger and the older, demonstrates that both groups look at continence from different positions, one from that of youth, the other from age; and that their respective attitudes merely reflect the feelings, the emotional rhythms, of youth and of age in their aggregates. In short, the general psychology of the subject is ignored, and the subject itself is regarded and *judged* from viewpoints of longevity.

Max Huhner is an example of authorities who leave out psychology in dealing with continence. In his recent and in the main excellent book, *Disorders of the Sexual Function*, in the chapter on Continence, page 261, he says: "In the following pages I shall endeavor to prove that continence is not detrimental to health, considered either from a physiological or psychological standpoint." He then follows with a long discussion of continence from physiological and neurological standpoints, citing with particular emphasis opinions of certain older neurologists, but ends the chapter without a word on the psychology of the subject. There is a long bibliography at the end of the book, which, however, omits the names of Freud, Jung, and other authorities on psychoanalysis. To ignore the findings of psychoanalysis in a modern discussion of continence is to disregard at least one half of the subject, and stamps the chapter as either old-fashioned or prejudiced, but in either case incomplete and inconclusive.

Dr. Huhner takes occasion to severely criticize another writer, Von Schrenck-Notzing, for advising indulgence in certain cases, together with prophylactic instructions against infection and illegitimate offspring. Referring to the last two words, Huhner says: "The prevention of illegitimate offspring leads us into the realms of criminality, and such a statement ought not to be tolerated in any legitimate monograph!" Huhner's display of conventional indignation in this matter suggests that he is not open to any considerations involving intelligent birth control, or practical prevention of venereal disease based on *existing conditions.*

It appears to be well established that strict physical continence can be maintained indefinitely, *provided* that the sexual or creative energy is transformed into other modes of energy, in which the *interest* is concentrated. But it can be stated just as definitely that unless the mental and emotional interests are actively satisfied by the substitution, continence may then cause *repression* of sexual energy into the unconscious, where it works in secret, revealing itself to trained eyes in many symbolic ways, among them the protean aspects of hysteria and neuroses, and some forms of insanity.

Continence, therefore, may or may not be detrimental to health, depending on the psychological status of each case individually. It is a personal matter, and in matters of sex all cultured people must be a law unto themselves. The ethics of the subject must rest, not on formulas of conduct, but on considerations of equity and of expediency. The most that can reasonably be done is to suggest courses of action that in individual cases have seemed to work for good. From this broad platform, then, it is advised that in heart attachments between married people and others, continence be the rule. The reasons for this conclusion are taken from different angles of the subject.

(1) In the first place comes the question of fidelity to the married partner, and what fidelity means. The ideal of monogamy has gradually been adopted by all progressive nations, and against Man's natural polygamous tendency. That fact speaks for itself, and indicates the true course of progressive social evolution. A true monogamy includes fidelity to the marriage vows, and therefore married

virtue would appear to be an essential of right social evolution.

(2) Few people are emancipated enough to calmly contemplate the thought of sharing their husbands or wives sexually with others. Hence such licence by one causes suffering to the other. The only way to have the indulgence and not cause suffering is to use secrecy. Secrecy invariably leads to deception, and deception is violation of one of the three eternal principles—Truth. To be untruthful is to lose self-respect; and to lose *that* is the beginning of general deterioration.

(3) The complete physical union is such a profoundly personal thing, so completely and even terribly intimate, that unless both are wonderfully attuned—physically, mentally, emotionally—the union may fall short of the ideal union that was anticipated; and then comes more or less disillusionment. To be thus disillusioned is very regrettable because it means that something precious has been lost in what before had seemed an ideal association. A strong and controlled friendship

between a man and woman may be a source of undreamed-of inspiration and mutual betterment, as history shows. So why risk such a divine thing by straining it to its physical limits? By exposing it to the perhaps scorching flame of passion, when it already irradiates two lives with happiness?

(4) Finally, should disillusionment result, it would only serve to emphasize the unpleasant consciousness of wrong done in breaking the marriage vows, and in the secrecy and deception involved. Thus what had been a beautiful and even ennobling love when kept within certain restraints might destroy itself by yielding to passion which disregarded the happiness of others.

### *Fidelity*

The usual understanding of the word fidelity in marriage is physical faithfulness to the wedded mate. Furthermore, physical fidelity is commonly regarded as the most important and essential of all the obligations of marriage.

Proof of its infraction is an immediate cause for the granting of divorce in the laws of nearly all States, and it is the only cause for separation recognized by the Roman Catholic Church.

Mental fidelity or heart fidelity, while conceded to be a duty and important for happiness, is nevertheless thought of as quite secondary to physical fidelity. These are the ordinary or conventional ideas as to fidelity.

To many people, however, there occurs the question: Is mere physical fidelity so all-essential, if the heart is no longer there? If the thought and feelings are with another, is not the mere bodily faithfulness little more than the empty shell?—the clothing instead of the one beloved? Even a *dead* body may be beautiful, but what is it worth without a *soul?* Indeed, for those who accept the Bible as authority the question is definitely settled in those words attributed to our Lord in which He gives the heart equal significance with the body when a man *looks* on a woman with desire.

There is one other commonly accepted view about fidelity, or rather infidelity. It is that when a married man loves another woman, or a married woman loves another man, the respective wife or husband is neglected or treated cruelly. In many such instances the reverse is what happens. I will mention two examples:

A well-known artist friend had a beautiful wife and child. He treated them with solicitous care and affection, and his wife admitted that in his conduct to her he was not only always courteous and attentive, but also loverlike, and spent nearly every night at home with her. Their married life, in fact, was ideal, until one day she happened to discover that he had an affair with another woman. The wife reacted in the usual way. The man admitted the affair and frankly said that his temperament sometimes responded to other women sexually, but that she, his wife, held his only real heart interest; that she was the only woman he wished to be the mother of his children; in short, that other and lesser loves were as nothing to him in his *heart*. He asked if she had anything to complain of in his conduct to her, sexually and otherwise, and she was obliged to admit that he had been a perfect husband. But she could not endure the knowledge that other women shared, even momentarily, his physical interest. She was wildly jealous, sued for and obtained a divorce —and has regretted it ever since.

In the other example a foreign friend said, "My wife has been so unusually loving and attentive lately that I am almost sure she has a lover." I was surprised, and asked why he considered such ideal wifely conduct as symptoms of infidelity. He replied, "It is always that way when they love someone else." This was somewhat of a new view to an American, and I put it down to a curious expression of Latin jealousy. However, when I saw him later on he reminded me of our last conversation and said, "I was right in my suspicion. She has confessed it to me."

Many similar cases undoubtedly occur among developed and versatile people. The ordinary and superficial judgment of their kindness and loving care to their legal mates while at the same time loving others, is that it is all hypocrisy. But there may be a broader view, which is that when the emotional urges have normal and adequate *expression*, the entire nature and conduct are the better for it; and that people then actually radiate more love and kindness and good will than when under unnatural restraint through a channel which is inadequate, perhaps only temporarily, to transmit the tide of creative energy which strives for outlet.

This view agrees with the experience of Forel when he gave certain advice to married men who had lost romantic interest in their wives but found it in other women. Forel's advice was to think strongly of the other woman, to visualize her, as clearly as possible, when with their wives; in short, to *imagine* the wife as being the other loved woman. Some women who have read this advice have indignantly condemned it as being a cheat and imposition on wives. Their feeling is natural and the method at first thought seems unethical.

Forel assures us that it often restores men's lost sexual interest in their *wives*, and that happy result might be deemed to justify the psychic deception in the method employed.

The psychology of this appears to be as follows: When married people have become polarized, neither can be the outlet for the other's emotional energy. But when by the force of thought—and thought *is* a force—the polarized loved one is for the time being transformed into the likeness of an *un*polarized loved one, she then at once becomes a channel for the other's love force. Actually, for the time and to the husband, the wife *is* the other woman. It is as if he had gone away for awhile. And this separation in thought has an effect on man and wife like separation in space. Both become depolarized towards each other, and presently they find that they are again lovers.

Women who would feel jealous of other women in such cases might try to look at the proposition something like this: The separation in *thought*, which brought about their mutual rest and recuperation and restored them to each other's arms, could not have taken place but for the thought-image of the other woman in the mind of the man. The happy mutual result of that spiritual separation is due to the temporary inspiration of the thought-form of the other. In short, both man and wife owe their reunion to that woman, who, her beneficent mission fulfilled, leaves the pair to their joy. The "other woman," then, instead of being hated as a rival or love pirate, should be regarded more as an angel of happiness.

In any case, the Forel method supplies the element of physical fidelity, which to many means possession and morality. It would amount to fidelity in conventional society and in legal definition, and therefore we may define it as vicarious fidelity. (See Forel, in the *Sexual Question*, probably the most masterly work on that subject.)

It is recognized that the ideal marriage postulates a man and woman whose sex interests are centered in and entirely satisfied by each other. Frankness compels us to say that such ideal unions are not the rule but probably the exception. Moreover, having analyzed the causation of sexual interest, we have found that all interest, sexual and otherwise, depends on *inspiration;* that inspiration and its responses are natural phenomena, and therefore involuntary. "Love is sex love," says Michels (*Sexual Ethics*), and that appears to be true of all love or affection between men and women, even with love in its milder form as admiration. Every man admires every beautiful woman involuntarily; not merely because of her beauty, but because of beauty plus sex. Woman's beauty means to Man the beauty of her sex. Hence the involuntary admiration of every normal man for every attractive woman is sex interest.

A superficial reading of this chapter may possibly connote to some a defense of free love. It is nothing of the kind; merely a *frank* statement of certain facts as they *are* instead of as they *should be*, with suggestions for the interpretation of their psychology. The trouble is that many people have not the moral courage to look at such facts when they have personal application in their own cases. And yet only in the facing of the facts lies the hope, the promise, of redemption from their bondage.

Undeveloped individuals respond automatically and physically to sex attraction, as do the animals. Developed individuals also respond automatically, but having more development of will and conscience they can restrain the physical part of the response to a greater or lesser extent. Social conventions are in the main the unconscious expressions of evolutionary racial needs, and preëminently so the convention that demands sex restraint. Self-control in sex is the measure of men and of nations, and is further discussed in the chapter on Monogamy and Progress.

## CHAPTER XIII

### PSYCHOANALYSIS

THE profound extent to which thought is colored and influenced by sex is demonstrated by many outward signs. In the first place, what people talk about they think about. Considerations of custom or tact usually prevent open talk on intimate sexual matter in polite social gatherings. But as soon as the restraints are removed, the conversation nearly always veers around to sex. When people get to know each other well enough to lower the barriers of reserve, somehow sex seems to be an easy subject to talk about; which means that sex thought is interesting to most people. The most popular books and plays are those known to major the sex element. There are very few successful books or plays without at least something of love or sex in them. Even the powerful and unique *Dr. Jekyl and Mr.*

*Hyde* had to have a love episode added when it was put on the stage; and as a matter of fact it did add dramatic force and interest to the play. A thrilling exception is Lord Dunsany's *A Night at an Inn.* But imagine a grand opera without love scenes!

When all other signs of universal sex interest have been noted and listed, the most convincing of all signs is the remarkable interest now shown in books on psychoanalysis. Why should that be so when psychoanalysis is merely a development of analytic psychology? Why is psychoanalysis so much more popular than straight psychology? Why do even commonplace books on psychoanalysis outsell a really valuable book like William James' *Shorter Course in Psychology?* Simply because psychology appeals only to the intellect, while psychoanalysis appeals also to the emotions, and particularly to emotions inspired from sex considerations. There is the answer. People who would have been bored to death by a book on psychology, find psychoanalysis interesting reading.

Unquestionably psychoanalysis throws a new light on the entire sexual question. But many of its students have, it seems to me, gone too far with the sex hypothesis and think they find sex thought in almost every manifestation of consciousness. There are three reasons for this over-determination towards sex: (1) the personal influence of the leading authorities; (2) the kind of material studied; (3) their own personal bias.

(1) The personal influence of the leading authorities. The great pioneers, and after them others, are apparently one and all materialists, who disdain any spiritual conceptions or belief in survival of personality after death of the body. Having that attitude they would naturally incline to interpret even the highest emotions in terms of materialism; and therefore love in their view is only a libidinous reaction. It should be stated, however, that Jung and the Zurich School differ somewhat with Freud and do not apply the sex hypothesis as far as he does.

(2) The kind of material studied. Natur-

ally this is taken very largely from the type of persons who seek treatment for nervous and mental conditions; in short, abnormal people, often inferiors, whose loose and disjointed thought certainly does turn mostly around the pivot of sex differences.

(3) Their own personal bias. If that is strongly in the direction of sex they would then derive a kind of vicarious satisfaction from wallowing in the common cesspool of gross sex thought, and by finding and describing in others the hidden sex complexes which they more or less frankly recognize as the echoes of their own.

The most startling and fantastic erection of the Freudian School is the so-called "Œdipus Complex." This is a rather far-fetched application of the Œdipus myth to supposed incestuous tendencies in children towards their parents. A useful symbol when understood, the Œdipus Complex has developed into a true fetish in the minds of many students of psychoanalysis, who have overworked and misapplied it in many instances. The best explanation of it that I have read is that by Jelliffe in his *The Technique of Psychoanalysis*, an able work in every way, clear and sequential in its presentation, masterly in its style, and with apt quotations from the leading authorities. It may be said of psychoanalysis, as of other new methods of real value, that its worst enemies are its immature and "overdetermined" followers.

Regrettable examples are seen in the excessively bad taste shown by those who in public "analyze" the characters of honored and beloved celebrities through their autobiographies. A recent and singularly offensive instance, in book form, claimed to analyze Margaret Fuller. If the printed quotations are correct, the author's so-called analysis would appear to be based on the common misinterpretation of the Œdipus Complex derived from literal and inept translations of Freud and others. The writer should first have read Jelliffe's interpretation.

Naturally every adaptable and useful human being—I do not use the hypothetical term "normal" in this connection—has a positive sex side to his or her nature; and therefore all books may express some of their authors' sexual natures to true psychoanalysts. But to use that knowledge to pry into the intimate secrets of people living or dead—unless they be malefactors or public nuisances—is on a par with opening private mail or spying in bedrooms through keyholes.

In spite of its grossly materialistic trend—under the leadership of pioneers who are materialists—psychoanalysis represents a tremendous and truly epochal advance in psychology. Furthermore, its practical value as a curative or corrective measure in certain neurotic and hysterical conditions has passed the experimental stage. But like most new and brilliant therapeutic methods, the claims put forward were extravagant, and psychoanalysis did not prove to be the panacea it was at first thought to be. Probably its most important end-result will be its influence on modern thought. The subject is so large and ramifies so extensively into almost every phase of consciousness that only a glance at some of its most prominent features can be taken here. The first in importance is:

*The Unconscious.* Many people are incredulous at the statement that the consciousness which expresses itself through the physical brain is quite the smallest part of one's total consciousness. Yet that is in a sense true. The largest part of consciousness is submerged and unrealized, and therefore *unconscious* to the outer brain consciousness. For this reason it is called the Unconscious mind. Deep in this submerged part of consciousness are all memories in absolute perfection of everything in the personal experience; numerous hidden desires; obscure and unsuspected motives for action. The bearing of all that stress in the Unconscious on conduct and action in waking life is enormous. But a very important thing to realize is that the quality of thought of the unconscious mind is different from that of the waking or conscious mind. Its thinking processes are primitive, childish, archaic. It can only think deductively, and is subjective to hypnotism and to auto-suggestion. It is entirely unmoral, and is quite ruthless in the means it would employ to obtain the fulfillment of its desires. All intense emotional longings that cannot be satisfied in the waking consciousness are shunted into the Unconscious, and there elaborated or dramatized into wish fulfillments by ruthless and destructive means which the *conscience* of the waking consciousness would never think of employing. In sum, the Unconscious is the realm of primitive *desire*.

The old belief that an illicit and therefore "wicked" love could and should be crushed and killed out by force of will and awakened conscience, is refuted by psychoanalysis. Deep emotional interests are never killed out by such efforts; they are merely driven out of sight below the threshold and into the unconscious, where, unseen and more or less unsuspected, they continue to live and grow, profoundly influencing the entire personality.

The only way to deal with such emotions constructively is to face them in the open, to analyze them, and then to heroically discard any longings that are distinctly selfish and whose fulfillment would hurt others or cause them sorrow. Yet quite as frankly one should hold to and cherish whatever there is of *unselfish* love in his or her heart, and to whatever in the other one is good or beautiful, ennobling or inspiring.

*Psychic Energy*. Each personality expresses itself in terms of vital energy, or has a definite output of energy, which normally expresses itself through the three aspects of Consciousness: Cognition, Emotion, Volition; or knowing, feeling, and willing; which transposed into lower terms are: Thought and reason; Desire; and Action. A part of the energy that expresses itself in action, but only a part, goes in the direction of reproduction or re-creation, the passing onward of the life of the race, showing forth as love of the opposite sex and desire for union, and love for children. The creative urge may also manifest as desire to create in other ways—science, invention, art, music, writing, acting, and so on. Where the environment is unfortunately inimical to the normal expression of the great creative urges the psychic energy will then, in normal cases, flow outward through other normal channels. But sometimes, where the dominant desires are thwarted and cannot work themselves out through other normal channels, something else happens. The psychic energy accumulates, dams up, as it were, and overflows after a time through abnormal channels. The outward signs of this abnormal and destructive process are the protean symptoms and complaints of neurotic and hysterical persons; psychopathic tendencies, as certain insanities and perversions; inefficiency in their uncongenial occupations; and disturbance of the bodily functions of assimilation, nutrition, and elimination; also, though more rarely, the curious phenomenon of double personality.

*Dream Signification.* According to the present authorities on psychoanalysis, all dreams signify fulfillments of wishes in the unconscious part of our consciousness. I accept this only in part, as I know from personal experiences and the experiences of others that some dreams are much more, and some much less, than that. However, it seems to be established beyond argument that the majority of dreams are expressions of wish-fulfillments in the Unconscious, certainly for people of average development. The Unconscious, being as already said unmoral and ruthless in its desires, works them out in detail and dramatizes their complete fulfillment, without regard to conventions or considerations of right or wrong. But when it tries to project them into the waking brain consciousness it encounters a kind of reluctance or resistance which is based largely on habitual considerations of convention or propriety, when the dream episodes violate them. And then comes into operation another factor of very great importance which is called

*The Censor.* This is a kind of psychic mechanism which stands on guard at the gate of the waking consciousness and modifies or *censors* the dream episodes into forms which are presentable or in conformity with conventional standards. In order to do this the Censor resorts to such means as symbolism, distortion, inversion, and often complete obliteration of dream memory. It frequently makes use of similar thought association tracks of the preceding day, though sometimes it also uses old and forgotten memories long buried in the depths of the Unconscious.

Examples in point are dreams of deaths of relatives. When analyzed according to Freud's system, such dreams often reveal subconscious wishes for deaths of relatives because their deaths would remove obstacles standing in the way of fulfillment of desires in the Unconscious. Lest this statement should come as a shock to many people who have had such dreams, it will be well to reiterate that the unconscious part of us is the realm of unqualified *desire*, which is therefore unmoral and ruthless, and which often escapes from control of the higher self in sleep.

Dreams which refer to fulfillment of desires in the Unconscious having unconventional sex elements in them are often symbolized very elaborately, as by hard wearying tasks, frantic efforts to catch trains, climbing steep stairways, pursuit by wild boars or bulls, bites by serpents, wounds by sharp instruments, and trampling under foot by horses. But dream symbolism varies for individuals, and to such an extent that it would appear to be impossible to write a dream book which could apply very accurately to all dreamers.

*Rationalization.* Most of us are in the habit of believing that our actions and general conduct are, as a rule, dictated by conscious reason and judgment. Psychoanalysis indicates that the reverse is what usually happens; that our actions and conduct, where emotion is strongly involved, are motivated by unconscious desires and impulses. Afterwards, in order to justify ourselves, we think out reasons which should have impelled us, and actually make ourselves believe that they did. A little honest and fearless self-examination will convince anyone that we often do this. Disparaging or hostile criticism often exhibits rationalization to an extreme degree. Good examples are found in the bitter criticism of Richard Wagner by three contemporary composers. One of them, a certain Doctor Hanslick, tried to prove specifically that Wagner's works could never succeed because they disregarded certain conventional musical forms, notably 4-measure phrasing. Hanslick composed eight operas, of which not even the names are now remembered. Wagner produced eleven great operas, of which nine are world-famous. Anton Rubinstein, a truly great instrumental composer, criticized Wagner so violently and bitterly as to leave no doubt that the emotion he displayed came from jealousy because of complete lack of success with his numerous and ambitious operatic compositions. Camille Saint-Saëns, the composer of *one* successful opera, stigmatized Wagner's *nine* successful operas as "inferior work." And so on.

*Contrast.* Allied to rationalization is a peculiar subconscious defensive attitude assumed when certain dominant tendencies are in conflict with conventional conduct, or for any other reasons remain unsatisfied. In this class belong all attitudes of exaggerated morality or prudery: Virtuous but entirely unattractive women sexually who are shocked at garments that outline a rounded breast or display graceful legs; ministers of the gospel who preach with obvious emotion against bathing suits that show knees and elbows; modest reformers who drape statues and apply fig leaves; wallflowers who see immorality in dancing. In all of these, and many others of their ilk, psychoanalysis will easily find a hidden or subconscious attraction for the things they outwardly condemn, and bitter subconscious envy of those who are in positions to enjoy what they cannot. An example of that emotionally starved type of individual was the late notorious and ridiculous Anthony Comstock, who spent the latter years of his life in draping statues, hunting pornographic pictures, and lecturing on "fig leaf morality." See reference to Comstock in *Psychoanalysis and Behavior*, André Tridon.

*Hysteria and Neuroses.* As concerns this book, by far the most important phases of personality that psychoanalysis throws its searchlight on are the abnormal conditions known as hysteria and the neuroses. Hysteria is most common in women, and the neuroses in men. A long series of investigations by many observers seems to have confirmed Freud's original statement that in most cases (though *not* in *all*) there exists a sex basis. It would take too long to go into that here, except to say that the dreams of hystericals and neurotics, interpreted by psychoanalytic methods, usually reveal the sexual complexes at the bottom of their troubles. The demonstration of the correctness of this theory is seen in the results of treatment in logical accordance with it. The principle involved is this: When subconscious motives of action and conduct are brought to the attention of the conscious mind, the abnormal actions and symbolic dreams cease. Beneficial results have been obtained in enough cases to verify the statement just made. But there remains a considerable minority whose members are not so benefited.

The determining factor in psychoanalytic treatment in a certain case—where it will succeed or fail—is the presence or absence of sufficient will power in the patient. In other words, to drag the hidden and unconscious cause of a neurosis or hysteria into the outer consciousness will effect a permanent cure *only* if the patient has enough resolution to dominate it; otherwise there can be only temporary improvement followed by a relapse. Here is an example of successful treatment:

An hysterial married woman, young, handsome, intelligent, refined, and somewhat prudish, was tactfully advised by her physician to consult Dr. Brill. She was merely told that he was a specialist on nervous diseases. She promised to see him soon, but in the interim she told a woman friend about it. The friend looked surprised, and advised her not to see Dr. Brill as he only treated sexual cases. The patient was shocked, and realized that her family doctor must have thought that her trouble was sex when he sent her to Dr. Brill. It was a blow to her modesty and prudery, but also a fillip to her pride. She did *not* go to Dr. Brill, but her hysterical symptoms disappeared and she become a normal woman again.

The successful result in this case is more instructive and significant than if the patient had actually consulted the famous psychoanalyst and come under his personal influence. The unconscious sex complex was revealed *indirectly* when she realized that she had been advised to consult a "sex specialist," as her friend called Dr. Brill. What is emphasized is the correctness of the idea in psychoanalytic treatment, which is to make the patient *understand* himself or herself.

Reiterating what was said in a preceding paragraph, the success of psychoanalytic treatment with hysterical women depends on their having sufficient will power to dominate their Unconscious, once they are brought face to face with it. But the sad thing about it all is that the conditions which first caused the trouble still remain, in most cases, and may later on bring about a relapse. The only sure hope of permanent cure must depend on the removal of the first cause, the correction of the fundamental error.

Psychoanalysis has done much good, for it has demonstrated that the first cause in hysteria usually lies in some maladjustment or inharmony in the sex life of the pair. But the most it could do was to put the patient in the position of one forewarned and therefore forearmed. It could point out but not remove or locate the cause of the danger. At best it could only put up a kind of stockade, and from that stockade of knowledge plus will power, maintain a constant defense. But beyond the fact that it was somehow sex, it could not solve the problem of the first cause because it did not know what it was.

That knowledge is now, we believe, at hand, for very many cases, and with it the remedy. It is the knowledge of the fact of the rhythmic sexual cycle in women, and the regulation of married life in accordance with it. "For marriage is fundamentally a sexual union, and its success or failure, all things considered, is largely determined by conditions arising from the actual problems of sex."[1]

Greek philosophy summed up in three words everything worth while and enduring in the Universe—the Good, the True, and the Beautiful. Frankness is another word for Truth. Modern medical treatment trends always more and more away from drugs and towards mental and emotional readjustments. More than that, those readjustments are accomplished not by suggestion or camouflage but by uncovering and facing the causes behind the effects—in a word, the *Truth*.

As conscious secrecy is the protector and agent of all evil in conduct, so *un*conscious secrecy operates to conceal the ultimate evil causation of many disease conditions. The negative aspect of Nature, in conduct and in disease, can only manifest when its sources are hidden. What is true for individuals is true for pairs, for groups, for races. Consciously we shun the contemplation of our weaknesses and the memories of bitter or humiliating experiences. But *un*consciously we brood over deep emotional feelings, whether of desire or repulsion, and try to hide them from our conscious life. It is this unconscious brooding, or inner conflict, which if prolonged shows forth disguised as many disease symptoms and various neuroses. Wide professional experience shows that when the unconscious and hidden causes are uncovered and dragged out before the consciousness, the abnormal expressions usually cease.

---

[1] Wm. Fielding in *Sanity and Sex*, page 188.

This negative principle of unconscious concealment finds expression in the unhappiness of many marriages. The causation is often centered in unpleasant memories which have been transferred from the conscious to the unconscious, and there preserved and elaborated into complexes. The unconscious activity would tend to show outwardly as reluctance to discuss or read anything that might recall the hidden memories or suggest them. Intellectual and cultured people who had certain little sins of personal carelessness to their accounts would unconsciously take the attitude that they and their like do not have to be told of crude and obvious causes of marital discord, such as relate to deportment or personal hygiene.

When there are such hidden complexes underlying married unhappiness, and they are deliberately sought for and brought to the surface of consciousness, the results are usually comparable with the results obtained in the treatment of disease or neuroses which depend on analogous mental and emotional complexes. The complexes and their power for evil are broken up as soon as the searchlight of conscious attention is directed on them, and the personalities are liberated.

The conscious intellectual level of a person is one thing, and the *un*conscious desire level quite another. Certain information that may seem crude or even stupidly obvious to the cultivated intellect, may be just that which has been carelessly thrown into the unconscious, and then *consciously* forgotten, and is now the cause of trouble. The unconscious never forgets anything which has an emotional content, and if possible works it up into a complex that later may manifest symbolically and destructively in the conscious life.

The first requisite of those who would know and remove such possible causes of their married unhappiness is *moral courage:* the courage that to many would be greater than to serve in first-line trenches; the courage to face in their ugliness our own imperfections; and then the even greater courage to correct them, instead of pushing them back again into our unconscious, which then rationalizes excuses and defenses at the expense of others.

Hence the constructive and limitless value of Truth, in its aspect as Frankness, in marriage as everywhere else.

## CHAPTER XIV

### INDIVIDUALISM AND ITS CONSEQUENCES

One of the causes of the greater stress in married life now than in the times of our ancestors is the far greater development of individualism now than then. In these days people read more, study more, think more, know more, and *live* more than formerly. Women have emerged from serfdom into equal legal rights and privileges with men, and with the larger freedom and experience which that equality gives them. All that has resulted in a tremendous impetus to the development of individualism in both sexes but notably in women.

Our female ancestors were reared and educated under conventional restraints. They were secluded from much of the mental and emotional life of the living world. Their reading was supervised and censored by their husbands. Under that system most of them grew up submissive and dutiful, recognizing woman's lot as the inferior one, and obeying their husbands even if they could not strictly comply with the other two pledges of the marriage yoke.

But that system and that time have passed away forever. The social world now has the great fact of individualism before it, within it, a part of itself, with all that means in the way of radical changes in customs and habits, in revised standards of conduct, of domestic relations, of sex problems.

The only reasonable attitude is to admit and recognize and welcome the new individualism and its ever growing demand for greater freedom of expression. The problem is not how to check individualism but how to guide it along constructive lines. The sanest method would seem to be to seek for a simple standard of conduct, based on obvious common interest and common sense, which could make a convincing appeal to ordinary justice and expediency. Most reasoning people have come to know that whatever is best for the common good is best for the individual good. Furthermore, the truest liberty and the freest scope for individualism are invariably found in a system which stresses the common good. It comes back in the end to the simplest and profoundest teaching ever given to men: Do as you would be done by. All the ethical teachings of philosophy, theology and jurisprudence and all rules of conduct are summed up in those seven words.

Now as to individualism and social conventions. The most serious aspect of individualism, it goes without saying, is in relation to the freer association of the sexes. Every personality has its responsibility to every other personality, and the more developed a personality becomes, the more is its responsibility. All educated persons who are conscious of a growth of individualism in themselves which seems to demand freer sex expression should remember that many more persons who are ignorant and undeveloped morally will fancy themselves also "individuals," and will slavishly imitate their superiors in intellect and social position. Intellectual and cultured men and women almost always have at least some development of will power and conscience, discretion and sentiment, and those virtues are not likely to be entirely forgotten at such times as they may yield to unconventional sex attraction. On the other hand, ignorant and uncultured people have as a rule little conscience, no discretion, no will power, and of course no sentiment. That which means unconventional love to the individualist, means nothing but rank license to the man in the street.

Before the development of individualism in the higher classes became so obvious to everyone, the common herd had its lapses, of course, but in the main its sex passions were held in restraint by conventions, by religious authority, and—above all—by *habit*. Now "Habit is the great fly-wheel of Society, its most precious conservative agent," says William James. But notwithstanding the power of habit, we have to reckon with imitation, which is one of the strongest forces in sentient nature. When the herd sees its social superiors doing attractive things which are also possible to it at its corresponding level, it begins to imitate them. The habit of ages which had restrained its passional nature within safety limits is threatened and begins to relax. Once out from under authority, whether legal or conventional or religious, there is no limit to the license of the ignorant and uncultured man except in capacity and opportunity. For the demonstration of this tendency on a large scale it is only necessary to cite the atrocities committed during the Great War and afterwards in Russia.

All cultured people who think they feel the call of sex individualism in their blood should realize that whenever they shock the conventional sentiment of a community they are setting examples which will surely be imitated by many undeveloped and irresponsible persons. "Unsettle not the mind of the ignorant man," says one of the sacred books of the

Orient. To unsettle the ignorant mind to the extent of substituting sex license for sex control, is to sow the seeds of national and racial disaster.

From this point of view, then, not to speak for the moment of others, sex license or free love among people of the higher or educated classes is wrong. It gives example and excuse to the lower and undeveloped classes to depart from an ancient custom which has been and still is their greatest safeguard at their social level.

As to individualism in marriage. Individualism means of course expansion of consciousness and multiplicity of modes of self-expression; and all that means variety of fields of interest. The practical bearing in marriage is just this:

(1) When a developed or many-sided personality is united with another developed personality, and two or more of their interests are the same, there is a basis for reciprocal and enjoyable communion in those common interests; provided both recognize that the

other interests which each has that are not held in common may, if desired, be shared with other persons, within the boundaries of common sense.

(2) When a developed and versatile personality is linked with a single-track, or one-cylinder, personality, interest in the one common field of interest or medium of exchange is soon exhausted for the developed personality and is succeeded by disappointment, a sense of lack in the partner, and desire to find other companionship. The developed personality becomes polarized, and the exhaustion of interest in the one common field remains and may become permanent, unless the psychic energy is transferred to another field of interest, shared perhaps with another companion, and long enough to enable him or her to become depolarized.

Reactionary minds, who fear and therefore condemn individualism, point to the undoubted fact that our ancestors had less marital trouble than we have. They account for it by saying that our modern young people think and read and *know* too much, especially our women. I have in mind a brilliant but intolerant man who has a talented wife and two talented children. He is always in conflict with his family, and actually resents that they are not non-entities. He says: "The *trouble* with my family is that they are all individuals."

We admit that our ancestors seem to have had rather more domestic harmony than we have. And it may very well be that their relative immunity had something to do with their more limited field of thought and emotion, especially, be it repeated, of their women. Having far less mental and emotional experience than their descendants, naturally they had far less imagination. And "being deficient in imagination, love lacks the strong psychic or emotional appeal that it has in the more highly organized mentality." (William Fielding, in *Sanity in Sex*, page 196.)

A moment's thought will show that to be deficient in imagination is to be deficient in vision and in initiative; in brief, to be *inferior*. Therefore it follows that the unconscious ideal of the antis, stand-patters and reactionaries who clamor for censorship, long skirts, and fig leaves, is, in a word, *inferiority!* Moreover, those who argue for what analysis shows to be inferiority unconsciously proclaim their own measure.

This is the day, or rather the dawn, of individualism, and social conditions and conventions will have to adapt themselves to the new order. And this brings us to the bitter question of divorce. That question has already been dealt with so ably and nobly by many clear thinkers in recent years that the problem itself may be said to have been solved; solved, that is, in the same sense that many of the great public health problems have been solved; in the sense that the problematical features are now thoroughly understood, and that all that remains to be done is to break up the inertia,—political, conventional, and religious,—which yet stands in the way.

The intelligent attitude toward divorce is that which recognizes that where a normal man and wife have found that their interests and points of view are widely different, and they do not have two or more mutual interests in which they can heartily coöperate, those two are probably incompatible, essentially and fundamentally, and should separate and seek other mates: *provided* that the interests of their children will not suffer by the separation. However, some of the dreariest couples I know have held together from mistaken or superficial ideas on this head. It is open to question if children would not be more benefited by the happier and more spontaneous atmosphere after a readjustment in the parents' lives.

> Those who have gone most thoroughly into the question of social maladjustments and the remedies are pronounced in their advocacy of less restriction on divorce. . . . The happiness and well-being of the greatest number of people are of more concern to them than the maintenance of certain ancient tradition and age-worn customs. (William Fielding, in *Sanity in Sex*, pages 203–204.)

In the consideration of divorce the only question of right or wrong is the question of expediency. True expediency is always right, for in the nature of things the two are identical;

no wrong could be expedient in the larger sense. Looked at in this way, "Virtue no longer consists in literal obedience to arbitrary standards set by community or church, but in conduct consistent with the highest good of the individual and society."[1]

The fear is often uttered by Roman Catholic clergy and others that if divorce were easy the sanctity of the home would be destroyed and licentiousness would become general. That is not the argument of reason but of rationalization (I use the word in the psychoanalytic sense) in the endeavor to justify and bolster up an obsolete and now spiritually destructive convention. Actually the reverse should be more nearly true, namely, that if divorce were easier there would be fewer divorces. One of the irritating factors in a discordant marriage complex is the feeling of being bound without chance of escape. The irk of that feeling alone stimulates contrariness where there is already discord, and may unconsciously magnify mounds into mountains.

---

[1] J. P. Lichtenberger, in *Divorce, a Study of Social Causation.*

However, as to the effect of easy divorce on public morality and family integrity, we may confidently rest assured that "Marriage, in a word, has such sure allies in Man's psycho-physical conditions of life that we need not be afraid of freedom of divorce becoming equivalent to polygamy. What this freedom will abolish is only lifelong slavery."[1]

But after all is said, it is useless to argue about that which will inevitably come to pass. One does not need to be a seer to know that *some* things are decreed. Among those things are easy divorce, marriage of priests, and economic readjustment. And yet one other thing is just as certain: that the Institutions which oppose with their united strength those reforms will have two choices; to adapt themselves to them, or—fall.

By an interesting coincidence, as the last paragraph was being written, came the news that the Church of Poland had decided to allow its priests to marry. The Church of the Czecho-Slovak Republic made the same de-

[1] Ellen Key.

cision more than a year before. The Orthodox Greek Church has always insisted on marriage of the priesthood.

Coincident with the greater sexual freedom of women there has developed a corresponding tolerance of it by Society. Seldom now do we hear the old and self-righteous expression "lost" or "fallen" or "ruined" women, except in small towns. Insensibly Society has come around more to the square deal point of view towards women. The psychology of this change is interesting. The former attitude of scorn and ostracism towards single women, especially by women, who yielded to sexual attraction, was a form of unconscious sex defense. In those days mere physical virtue was a woman's prime asset. No man then, whatever his own sexual record, would think of taking to his "bed and board" any but a "pure" woman; none other was fit to become the custodian of his "honor," whatever that may have meant.

Now, however, we have Woman's Suffrage and all that that means in the way of sex equality and opportunity. Symbolically one of the most interesting outer signs of this great change is the change in women's clothing. The legs are the organs of locomotion, of freedom of action, of *liberty*. Any kind of clothing that limits the movements of the legs impedes freedom of action. Long skirts, hoop skirts, trains, and side saddles did that. Their use continued while women were in subjection, but they were discarded as Woman's freedom grew and grew. Short skirts, then, are symbols, not of immodesty, frivolity, or sex license, but of the freedom and equality of Woman.

It is significant that such objection as there is to short skirts comes only from those who for any reason stand for reaction and repression. In June, 1921, there appeared an Associated Press interview with a famous Parisian designer of women's clothing, in which he said that next year's fashions would probably see a considerable lengthening of skirts, due to demands of the Church. He said that while France was not nominally a Catholic country, still designers felt that they could not altogether ignore the wishes of the Church, and hence, for 1922, longer skirts and higher necks.

Taken at its face value, that interview connotes a slavish degree of mental subjection for a Frenchman. Taken psychologically it has quite another interpretation. Consciously or unconsciously it was put out as a feeler to test the reaction of women generally; to find out before the suggested 1922 fashion became enacted into fashionable Law, whether modern Woman could be bluffed into surrendering her hard-earned right to dress as free Woman should; or whether she had once and for all time passed beyond the coercion of repressive Institutions.

# CHAPTER XV

## ECONOMIC STRESS

THE public seems almost wholly unaware of a new type of young woman that has quietly grown up. This type has precisely the same sex standard as the average man. These girls, attractive and intelligent, earning fair salaries, living with parents or relatives, have one or more men friends with whom they in turn go out to dinner, then to a theater or dance hall, and afterward to a hotel. They do as they do, they frankly admit, not for pay but because *they like it.* They would scorn to accept money, though as a rule not averse to presents, as furs or jewelry. They will consider no offers of marriage except from wealthy men. They know that marriage and children with poor men mean economic slavery. From their experience with men they believe that *he* will be unfaithful anyway, while *she* is stuck with babies and poverty. So why marry? they say, when most of the joys and none of the limitations of marriage can be had without marrying? Furthermore, these girls have sex education. They know all about birth control and conceptual preventatives, in spite of taboo and censorship.

The psychology of this type of woman is a natural development from modern economic conditions. While it is true that most women have desire for motherhood, it is just as true that intelligent modern women know and cannot forget that motherhood now means martyrdom unless they have plenty of money. Consequently, large and increasing numbers of young women, so well fitted for motherhood, decide not to marry. Having made that decision, the urge to hold on to their sexual virtue becomes progressively weaker. This tendency is of course more or less unconscious, and comes from the elemental fact that sexual virtue in unmarried women has for its primal purpose the attraction of the mate and the father of the children. When husband and children are no longer desired, sexual virtue has no further practical significance or utility, and, unless conventional or religious restraint is strong, the maintenance of virtue comes to be viewed as a form of sterile asceticism.

When this attitude is reached a lover appears, a young man with views similar to hers. Both regard children as the only excuse for marriage. Both know that their combined incomes are not more than enough to support themselves comfortably or even decently, and that as soon as she becomes enceinte she would have to stop working and their income be reduced about half. They lack the courage—or the hardihood?—to enter marriage under such dismal conditions, and decide to enjoy youth and love with no obligations beyond mutual satisfaction.

And from *their* points of view why should they not do so? They have no constructive philosophy of life to indicate any other course. Religion promises post-mortem rewards for virtue and large families, but nothing here and now. Government truly says that national security rests on the integrity of the family life; but instead of offering inducements it adds burdens by taxing small incomes and by allowing only inadequate exemptions.

Nearly everyone knows the sex standard of the average man. Heretofore it has been the relative chastity of the woman, the potential *mother*, which has been the anchor of the social order. When, therefore, single young women, in larger and larger numbers, begin to abandon the age-old position of Woman and adopt the promiscuous sex standard of average Man: what else does it bode than a tendency which, if not checked by some constructive alternative, may eventually wreck the Institution of Marriage?

This type of woman *has arrived*. She is *here*. There is no use in blinking at it. The burning question is: What are we going to do about it?

As said before, education convinces every intelligent person that marriage without money spells martyrdom. It is easy enough for middle-aged reformers, in their salaried positions and comfortable homes, to talk about sexual purity and duty to the Race. All true. But it is nonsensical to expect altruism and heroism and willingness for martyrdom in young blood. Education has outsped economic readjustment. But education—whether political, spiritual, or sexual—cannot be stopped, either by Governmental censorship or the mimic thunder of the Church. The constructive alternative lies in economic readjustment and nowhere else. While Governments remain inert before present appalling economic conditions they trim their courses directly towards free love and race suicide.

Readers of *Harper's Magazine* will remember the illuminating articles—now in book form as *Hail Columbia*—by the British writer, W. L. George, on the American Woman, in which he discusses the difficulties amounting to economic slavery of American married women, particularly when they have children. In theory the American woman is put on a pedestal, worshiped and waited on, but in fact she has the hardest lot of all cultured women.

Domestic service is almost unobtainable in America even with incomes of $10,000 a year, and such as can be had at exorbitant wages is as a rule insolent, inefficient, and dishonest. And that of course means that the American wife and mother and home-maker must discard reading, study, diversion, and the vital problems in the education of her children, and deteriorate to the level of a household drudge.

Women I have talked with say that they find the strain of being *both* wife and mother almost intolerable under present economic conditions. How can a modern mother, they say, of moderate means, taking care of housework and babies, keep herself neat and clean and rested and an object of romantic interest to the average selfish and thoughtless man?

Most men have no conception of the tedium and drudgery of wives and mothers who cannot afford sufficient domestic service. Such husbands return home tired after a day's work in business. They are annoyed when, instead of finding well-kept, comfortable apartments and well-groomed attractive wives, they come into disorder, crying babies, and wives fatigued and preoccupied and unattractively dressed. The men in their annoyance forget that they are in part responsible for their present conditions. They want relaxation and diversion, and, poor fellows! they need them. They spend less and less time at home and always more at clubs, amusements, or with other women. Imagine the feelings of wives and mothers, thus circumstanced, who see their husbands drifting away from them, and no prospect of change for the better!

History teaches that all strong peoples have come up through long periods of nearness to Nature, living by hard work from the yields of land, flocks, and herds. Monogamy, many children, and frugality were the rule. Later on as certain men became wealthy and idle, they substituted riotous living for sane and productive activity. Idleness, luxury, and sex-license always go together. The poorer imitate the vices of the wealthy, as far as they can. And then commences the period of deterioration in which the stern virtues begin to be neglected and held in contempt. Manliness gives place to effeminacy, womanliness to flippancy, patriotism to cynicism. And by that time, as Roosevelt said, "the plunderer is at hand." The causes of such deterioration are ultimately economic, being the disproportion and the bad use of wealth.

In modern times there are the same tendencies as of old but immensely more complicated by the introduction of machinery. The holders of land became the owners of producing machinery, and they as a *class* now rule with a degree of despotism undreamed of before. The result is the economic slavery of all who do not hold land and machinery. Adam Smith believed that the competition of selfish interests would automatically maintain an equitable adjustment of economic conditions, and under that idea arose the slogan: "Competition is the life of trade." And that rule worked then, or seemed to, because life was not so complicated. Events moved more slowly, there was more room to spread out over, and no machinery to speak of. A later writer, comparing Adam

Smith's time with the present, sees that the changes are so marked and the conditions so different that social evolution can no longer proceed normally under a system of "balanced selfishness." Hence Competition is no longer the life but the limitation of trade.

The Capitalistic System does not seem to have learned any lesson from the World War nor from developments in Russia. Labor, still ignorant and unprogressive but learning rapidly, has realized its power, has tasted the fruits of that power, and will never again submit for long to the old system which grew on its exploitation. But the Capitalistic System seems to be again attempting to continue the old methods: lowering wages to the pre-war scale without corresponding decrease in cost of living; oppressing its high-grade employees by demanding over-time without pay; the same old curse of the middle-men, etc.

It is the extreme of folly, however, to blame individual members of the System, and to expect wrongs to be righted by violence or the removal of certain rich men. They are as much slaves of the System as are its helpless employees, and this is seen when sometimes a rich man attempts reforms in his own establishment. He incurs the wrath of the united System, feels its heavy and ruthless hand, and, often, the ingratitude of the people he tried to help. Henry Ford appears to be the first successful exception. May continued success be with him—to the extent to which he honestly works for good!

The System is a tremendous Entity, moving backwards by its own blind momentum, a commercial Lucifer which defies the forward movement of Evolution. It cannot reform because it has no united will to reform, and no vision beyond self-interest. The only possibilities of change would appear to be along the following lines:

1. The gradual pressure and encroachment of Labor on Capital until the System knows that it must either compromise or fall.

2. The development of practical coöperative or communistic systems on a large scale.

3. The pulverization of the System when the accumulated forces of Evolution overwhelm it. The last would probably mean a social cataclysm like that of Russia.

Further discussion of the economic problem would be out of place in this book. What I have said is in a measure describing the obvious, but many of us need to be occasionally reminded of it. The obvious is so familiar that we are apt to overlook it; and so tiresome that we unconsciously take the ostrich attitude toward it. Enough has been said to emphasize that in the final taking of stock the marriage problem is inseparable from the economic problem. No amount of knowledge of the special problems of love and sex can avail in themselves without a sound economic foundation; nor can untold wealth alone bring married happiness unless there is understanding of the natural laws of personal relationships.

In sum, economic stress is directly responsible for the ruin of many marriages, the prevention of many more, the prevention of children in the better classes, and the spread of free love. Economic stress has its roots in the fundamental errors in the present World System. How those errors may be corrected we can only surmise. Let us hope that the signs of our time do not mean that it is now with us as it was with "Mighty Rome; corrupt, unchaste, and tottering to its fall!"

As Civilization endured and emerged from the night of the Middle Ages, and still stands after the World War, we can only trust that as the issue is greater than personalities or Systems, Society will somehow resolve the present impassé without having first to endure the purifying fire of a great devastation.

# CHAPTER XVI

## MONOGAMY AND PROGRESS

In studying the psychology of sex individualism it is instructive to contrast the sex standards and the material strengths of the representative nations of today. The Americans, British, and Northern peoples generally, try to live up to a rather stern standard of married virtue, in which the wife and mother is the one object of sex interest. They have a monogamous system outwardly, though with much clandestine polygamy, but they raise the standard of monogamy and are ashamed of their polygamy; all of which signifies some considerable attempt at self-control in sex.

The Latins also have an outwardly monogamous system, but are much more polygamous. They desire children, but generally regard the wife only as the mother and as the social representative of the man. "Romance and marriage do not go together," frankly say the men. "A woman married six months and without a lover is a fool," said a titled Italian lady. In sum, many Latins do not regard self-control in sex as a virtue to be cultivated. And from their platform they are consistent. Regarding the wife as soon ceasing to be an object of romantic interest, a life of married virtue would then mean a life without romance or passion—a thwarted life, in fact. Hence the Latins are apt to consider self-control in sex as meaningless asceticism.

The only European nation which still authorizes polygamy is Turkey. Turkey is the successor of the great Moslem Empire, which had its wonderful rise, its decline, and its fall, as with all great Empires and States of the past. The fall actually occurred some one hundred years ago, though a fictitious semblance of nationality is kept up even after the World War, but only because the other nations of Europe could not and cannot decide on an amicable division of what remains of

Turkish territory. The only fact of interest in this reference to Turkey is that the one modern polygamous nation of Europe has neither stamina nor capacity for improvement. It could not compete with or even exist contemporaneously with progressive nations but for their sufferance and indecision.

The Northern nations dominate the modern world. France holds a middle ground but emotionally is nearer to the Latins. The peoples of the North have—or strive for—self-control in sex. The Latins do not. Self-control in sex means self-control in every other way. Self-control is one of the elements of *efficiency*. How much of the Northern dominance and superior energy and efficiency may ultimately depend on their greater effort at self-control in sex?

The adoption of monogamy by all modern progressive nations is one of the most significant developments in social evolution. Monogamy is not natural but artificial. It has come to be a system in much the same way that Common Law has developed—from long experience and from expediency. *Man's* natural tendency is towards polygamy; it is ostrich-like to ignore so patent a fact. *Woman's* natural tendency is *not* towards polygamy or polyandry, under normal or livable conditions. The present greater sexual freedom of women is not to be interpreted as preferential sex license, but as a sequential development from modern economic stress and slavery. It is to the Race what hysteria and neuroses are to individuals; an abnormal expression of a normal *urge*, the great Creative urge, which is thwarted from right expression through the normal channels of marriage and parenthood by the prevailing and criminal economic conditions, which, if not corrected, threaten Civilization itself.

The remarkable fact that monogamy has been chosen, against masculine tendency, by the most advanced peoples after ages of experience, is the surest indication that it is the best System for right social evolution. It is noteworthy that monogamy coincides with emancipation of woman. The more advanced a people, the better they treat their women. As the natural tendency of Woman is against polygamy while Man's is toward it, the inference is plain that the gradual abandonment by Man of his strongest selfish urge is a sure sign of the growing participation of Woman in the councils of men, and of her place in Nature as Man's inspiration to his betterment.

Hence the present tendency of single women towards free love cannot be regarded as otherwise than social retrogression of ominous import. The blame is not theirs but that of a soulless economic system which has its parallel in Nero fiddling while Rome burned.

The question of polygamy, however, is now squarely before some of the nations whose men were depleted by the slaughter of the World War. In England alone there are said to be some 2,000,000 women in excess of men. Has Society a right to deny to those women the experiences of love and parenthood when it has not enough men to go around? The question involves not only fair dealing but expediency. Conventions, after all, are mere working rules of conduct for normal times. In the presence of emergencies they always have to be made to fit developments. So in the present sad emergency with its plurality of marriageable women and paucity of men. "Nature is stronger than nurture" in the presence of great calamities. Unless some sane and *human* arrangement is legally enacted for those true war widows, Nature will take its own course with many of them, and they will seek their compensation either in free love or in prostitution.

Aside from the "moral" aspect of the question in this emergency is its effect on national birth rates. The nations involved have two courses before them to choose from. The first is *Convention* and practical sterility from millions of potential mothers whose yield of children from free love and prostitution will be almost *nil* on account of neglect, abortion, venereal disease, wide knowledge of conceptual preventatives; and such children as survive will be not the fittest but the unfit. The second course will be *temporary legalized* *polygamy*, and, for Britain, say 4,000,000 average children added to the national birth register.

While the evidence seems to prove that the monogamous system is the best, it has some aspects that are not good. Actually the system is not so much a fact as a *sham;* a fact for a few, a sham for the many. Under its outer show of righteousness and high morality is a mass of deceit and hypocrisy, of real polygamy, free love and prostitution, and degradation of women. Looked at in that way it is a "whited sepulcher." Perhaps the real lesson of monogamy is the psychological one, the exhortation to self-control. As already said, self-control in sex, not amounting to abnormal repression, means self-control in most other lines of conduct, and therefore character-building and all-around efficiency. Self-control is the basis of *unselfishness*, and unselfishness is the inspiration and the motive power of all improvement and all true progress in social evolution.

The *ideal* of monogamy is therefore an excellent one to hold on to and to live up to as far as possible. There is something beautiful in the ideal of fiancée, wife, and mother of one's children, all united in one radiant woman; and whatever is *beautiful* is necessarily ennobling. This ideal is fondly believed in by nearly all developed men and women *before* they marry. The trouble about ideals generally, and that one in particular, is that in their fineness and beauty they shrink away out of sight before the monumental ugliness and crassness of modern "civilized" life in cities. The Latins frankly say and believe that the ideal of one woman cannot last. The Northerns maintain that it does,—or *should*, rather; and probably they are nearest the truth. We *know* that the married ideal is realized in *some* instances. And those few, shining out like the larger stars in a murky sky, are an earnest of what *can* be true for others in the better time that we must affirm is surely ahead, when economic conditions shall be adapted to the needs of the many, rather than as now for the luxury of a few.

# CHAPTER XVII

## ROOSEVELT ON MARRIAGE

The late President Theodore Roosevelt always stood for a very high standard of family life, and some of his opinions on love and marriage were stimulating and helpful. In a speech of which the keynote was patriotism he said that a man could not be patriotic or a good citizen if he loved another country as well as he loved his own country. He applied the same argument to marriage, saying that a man who loved another woman as well as he loved his wife could not be a good husband and father. Any of the opinions of that great man and (to me), greatest American, merit profound respect and deep consideration. His opinions and sentiments just cited may very well be accepted by most people as ennobling standards to try and live up to. But there is a minority for whom they require some modification, though remaining essentially true for them also.

First as to patriotism. There was a time when "My country, right or wrong" was thought to represent the highest form of patriotism. That was merely a wider application of the older European standard: "The King can do no wrong." Both were the rule before the awakening of what has been called community conscience. This community conscience has necessarily repudiated such primitive and outgrown ideas of patriotism. Kings can do wrong and countries—groups of people—can do wrong. An individual who has done wrong, and whose conscience is strong enough to dominate false pride (vanity) will not persist in his wrong course after he realizes that it is wrong, but will stop and try to right the wrong. When an enlightened nation has happened to do wrong and its people know it, it will endeavor to make amends. Only backward peoples of backward governments will shout: "My country, right or wrong" and blindly and stupidly support their statesmen in continuing what is obviously a wrong international policy.

When, therefore, a people has reached that stage of political evolution and self-examination wherein it can recognize and admit that it may do wrong, then comes the realization that they are not necessarily better than some other peoples or nations. Having been capable of wrong-doing, they are not essentially superior to others who have also sometimes done wrongly. The next step is the recognition of national, and later racial, equality.

When we recognize national equality as a principle, we then must admit that our greater love for the country of our birth or nationality is not founded on our country's superiority but on sentimental considerations. Apart from those considerations there is no reason why a person should not love two or more countries equally well. This wider international love may be better understood, or felt, by putting oneself in the position of a person of mixed stock, in whose childhood both languages were spoken, where the aspirations of both countries were intelligently talked about, and where the residence frequently alternated from one country to the other. Such persons would be very likely to grow up loving both countries about equally, though their citizenship would depend on what nationality the father decided to retain.

What about patriotism in such cases? And also in those others who have attained that wider view through study? Just this: Patriotism is more than love of country; it is also *duty* to one's country, and in the word "duty" is the guide. One may love more than one country, but one's duty is towards that country of which one is a citizen or subject. Duty is only another word for *service;* service in peace and in war.

Perhaps the highest possible love of country is a love which is not blind to its faults, and which strives to its utmost to correct those faults by word and example. The question of duty in war service need not be very difficult to decide, even in an instance where one's country had engaged in a war which in the person's best judgment was wrong and unjustified. Modern war service now includes so much that is reconstructive and humane, as hospital and ambulance service, that one entirely out of sympathy with the war could yet do his patriotic duty without invoking the unattractive and dubious rôle of the conscientious objector.

Secondly, as to marriage. Can a man or a woman be a good husband or wife, and parent, if he or she loves another man or woman as well as, or better than, the marriage partner?

The emotion of love is a definite reaction resulting from definite conditions. It can be inspired in the presence of those conditions; quickly where they are fully developed, as in love at first sight; slowly where they are less developed, as by propinquity. Its duration—or rather the duration of the *expression*—depends on the maintenance of the conditions required for love expression. Its strength, as just said, depends on the degree of completeness in which those conditions are present. Love, being a natural reaction or force, is as entirely unmoral as electricity. Given the appropriate chemical or physical factors, electricity results. Given the appropriate physical and psychological factors, love results.

If this hypothesis is correct, then the element of blame cannot exist where a married person meets and loves another man or woman. And this confronts us again with the question whether one can be a good marriage partner if loving another as well or better. Let us turn back to the analogous question in relation to patriotism and citizenship. It is possible for some people to love two countries equally well either when they are of mixed stock, or in the perhaps rarer cases of deep students and altruists. But in matters of duty or service, common honesty dictates that one's obligation is toward the country of which one is a citizen or subject.

So, it seems to me, in marriage. A man or woman may involuntarily love another woman or man as well as or better than the wife or husband. But the obligation, the duty, is towards the one in legal bonds,—unless there are questions of cruelty or disease, but in such cases the laws of most Northern countries now provide relief by separation or divorce. Love is an infinite and irresistible force, as wide as the Universe, the one eternal principle in Nature. Therefore a husband or a wife may love another woman or man, and still love the married partner as much as before. I say again that wrong-doing only comes in when the *expression* of that extra-marital love disregards suffering it may cause to a husband or wife; and here is where the power of the *will* must be brought to bear. A good test to apply when in the presence of such a situation is to put to oneself, sincerely and fearlessly, this question: Will the demonstration of my love for this other beloved one cause sorrow or injury to him or her, or to my wife or husband? If you truly and *unselfishly* love the other one, your conscience will then answer clearly and definitely.

That is the acid-test of love. Selfish love desires primarily to *receive* happiness from the ones desired, to *enjoy* them. Unselfish love desires to *give* happiness to the ones loved. The first is not love at all but only a form of acquisitiveness. The second is the true and lasting love, and is always going outwards in an ever-widening circle towards the infinite. Selfish desire tends always to contract one's life circle towards the finite center, and the extreme type and the logical conclusion of indrawing selfishness is seen in misers.

When an unselfish married person happens to have found as great or a greater love response in someone else, he or she should not try to kill out that new love, but instead try always to keep it noble and unselfish, thinking of the welfare of all who are loved, and not of his or her own happiness. If the husband or wife is broad enough to understand the wider meaning of love, there may then be a sane reciprocation of the additional love, and the very acquiescence in it may enhance or renew the love between husband and wife. But otherwise, a jealous or over-conventional disposition of one of them will demand that not only all demonstration of love must cease, but that the love itself must end. The unselfish and more liberal one would then probably terminate the association with the beloved friend, and might also conceive it a part of duty to try and stop loving. But that would be impossible, for ties of real love can never be broken, as they have their foundations deep in the heart of being. A high sense of duty would take care of all family obligations, but the heart would turn always more towards the other love, and in the same measure withdraw itself from heart interest in the one who vainly and ignorantly strove to *command* the love and loyalty which it could not *inspire*.

An interesting example is the love between Richard Wagner and Mathilde Wesendonck. Wagner had apparently been loyal and dutiful to his wife Minna until he met Mathilde, who had the capacity to inspire in him a greater love. One day his wife found a letter which revealed to her the situation between Wagner and Mathilde. And then she reacted just as anyone else of her personality and mentality would have acted. Poor, ignorant, common·

place Minna went to her brilliant rival and made a typical scene. Wagner with the greatest difficulty succeeded in preventing his wife from starting a public scandal. But he thereafter heroically refrained from seeing Mathilde, and bowed to conventional demands and what seemed to him his duty as a husband. Yet later letters to Mathilde showed that she held her own place as his greater love and source of inspiration. Minna, however, who demanded everything but could give nothing, soon lost what remained in her of interest to Wagner, and divorce eventually liberated him.

If things are to be judged by their results, then the result of the love of Wagner and Mathilde more than justifies itself. The direct outcome, the offspring, of that great love is the music-drama of *Tristan and Isolde*, a work which many of the deepest students believe has reached the ultimate heights of music. Here, then, was a love, illicit if you like, which had the power to inspire a divine outpouring of poetry and music, greater than had been, and that fifty years later had not been even remotely approached in grandeur of conception and power of expression. Perhaps there were other and less noble aspects of that love. Who knows and who cares? The one thing that really matters, and which remains with us always, is the divine music-drama of *Tristan and Isolde*, the imperishable monument to Love.

In closing this chapter discussing the Roosevelt standard of family life, a few reflections present themselves. Roosevelt lived up to the ideals he talked about. There can hardly be any doubt of that, for in spite of his fame and power and his many political enemies, none of them ever tried to malign his personal character by alleging entanglements with women. A man as frank as he, whose magnetic and dynamic personality made noticeable every situation in which he took part, could hardly have successfully concealed any sex irregularities if he had been involved in any. Indeed, with his independence of thought and his scorn of shams and subterfuges, it is doubtful if he would have tried or cared particularly to hide any course of action he chose to take, however irregular or unconventional. A lesser man might have assumed, more or less unconsciously, such a positive attitude on family purity before the world as a cover for personal frailities and domestic inharmony. But not such as he. These and other considerations seem to warrant the conclusion that Roosevelt was one of those who found in his own home that heart interest and heart rest which liberate the intellect from emotional stress and set it free in its own field. In a letter written to his sister while the Election was pending he says:

> As I went up the White House steps Edith came to meet me at the door, and I suddenly realized that, after all, no matter what the outcome of the Election was, my *happiness* was assured,—that even though my ambition to have the seal of approval put upon my administration might not be gratified, my *happiness* was assured,—for my life with Edith and my children constitutes my happiness.

In his own words we find the confirmation that his wife was his inspiration and equal, a true companion for a great man, one like Virginia Tracy's conception of the Queen of Sheba—"fitted to be a King's mate."

History has other examples of great men who found what Roosevelt found. One of the wonders of India is the famous Taj Mahal at Agra. It was from 1629 to 1650 in building, twenty-one years. The Temple was built by Shah Jehan as a memorial and tomb for his wife, Mumtaz—i—Mahal. The bodies of the Emperor and his wife rest there side by side during the centuries. Theirs was one of the greatest loves of all times. It is doubtful if any wife had greater influence and inspiration with her husband than did this Oriental woman. "The Taj is unquestionably the most beautiful edifice of the Seventeenth Century, and the supreme achievement of Mohammedan art" (New Int. Encl.). For all the world it stands as Man's greatest monument to Woman and Wife.

Peter the Great found in his second wife, Marta Skovronsky, a mate who seems to have attained the marriage ideal. The duration of their love is shown by the fact that she bore him eight children. She was not only his wife but also his councilor in affairs of state.

The Brownings appeared to have realized the Ideal, notwithstanding that one of the pair was an invalid and almost a cripple.

What Man has done, Man can do. The Ideal is the main thing. If we hold to it steadily, we will eventually become the Ideal.

# CHAPTER XVIII

## WOMAN THE CENTER

"HOME is not a hearth but a Woman." Here is a remarkable statement I read years ago, but regret that I cannot remember the name of the writer. Regardless of who wrote it down, the phrase should stand as an imperishable epigram. The more it is pondered over, the more convincing it becomes. The woman is in the home most of the time, superintends it, keeps it attractive, bears and rears the children, handles innumerable details, and, in the last word, *is* the home. The man is absent most of the day, he may be absent for months at a time, he may die, but while the woman lives, the home remains a home. A woman's significance to the home is often only realized when she dies or abandons it. The man for many reasons cannot take charge. He does not know how. Even if he could take time from his business he could not understand many of the vexatious details of the household and is helpless when confronted with them. The first and only thing to do if he would hold the home together is to find another woman to take charge. Until then it is chaos. The substitute suffices to maintain the home after a fashion, but not as the wife had done, until at last the man finds that home means hardly more to him than a roost. And thus, for his children's sake or his own, many a widower or divorced man marries again, "just to have a home."

The woman, therefore, is the *center* around which everything turns, from which nearly everything comes. The physical body of woman is and must ever be sacred as being the Temple of Life. It is also the Temple of Beauty and of Love, the vehicle through which comes the inspiration for most of the effort and achievement worth while.

As Man's greatest inspiration is Woman, it naturally follows that his ideal conception of her is often so exalted as to be difficult for her to measure up to. Looked at in one way it is unfair to expect it of mortal Woman. But looked at in another it should be an inspiration to Woman to strive to realize Man's ideal of her. It is good to feel that it will be easier for women to do so as time goes on. Men are steadily developing more spiritually, and as they increasingly realize Woman's place in Nature, and all they owe to her for her limitless devotion and sacrifice as wife, mother and comrade, their ideal will become not less beautiful but more practical and stable, impelling them to strive more to do *their* part and to be worthy of an ideal wife. Although some ideals may be impossible of complete accomplishment, yet to strive towards them develops character and brings us always nearer to them. The true spirit of Love is expressed in these two lines by Ella Wheeler Wilcox:

The golden glory of Love's light may never be mine,
But I will be worthy of it.

It is not too much to say that even the best that men can give is not good enough for the women who are the makers of their homes, the mothers of their children, and the sources of their inspiration.

### *Heart Rest*

Through the magical power of words men are often awakened to the pressure of certain world needs which they had only vaguely felt before. And then the well-chosen words which define a great world need become a kind of channel for constructive thought force, directing thought to the study of the conditions involving that world need, and later to the knowledge of the means that can bring relief.

Such a magical phrase is one among many that occur in Bulwer-Lytton's great novel, *Zanoni*, where the sage Zanoni says to the ambitious and talented artist, Glyndon, "The heart must rest, that the mind may be active." One of the world's greatest needs is stated in those simple words. How much of the mental unrest in the world is because so many hearts are *not* at rest! Mental unrest means lack of concentration on work and duties, and that in turn means retardation of world output, of world achievement; the postponement of that happier time when economic conditions will be better adjusted and life will be easier and fuller.

All great thinkers arrive at the same conclusions when they think along similar lines; whether by means of a higher form of telepathy, or because of that essential unity of consciousness which is a logical necessity in all philosophic reasoning. It is therefore significant to note that Bulwer's poetic conception of a great world need is stated in different words but in exactly the same sense by a purely scientific writer. Thus Havelock Ellis says:

> While it is perfectly true that sexual energy may be in large degree arrested, and transformed into intellectual and moral forms, yet it is also true that pleasure itself, and above all, sexual pleasure, wisely used and not abused, may prove the stimulus and liberator of our finest and most exalted activities.

Here may be cited the famous case of the mathematician to whom came the long-sought solution of a problem during the ecstasy of sexual union. Superficial criticism of this case has said that the man cared less for his wife than for his problem. But deeper analysis suggests the reverse. The completeness of their physical union not only symbolized but attained for a moment that actual unity of *Consciousness* which all great philosophies recognize as eternally present in that Divine Mind in which we all "live, move and have our being," and in which are all knowledge and all wisdom, and the solutions of all problems.

All who have had real and transcendent love experiences, perhaps only one in their lives thus far, value those memories more than any other memories, and would not blot them out for anything the world could offer. Such experiences leave not only beautiful and elevating memories, but also true expansions of consciousness which represent a permanent gain in each one's individual evolution.

The experience of Ages has shown that hearts can only find rest on other hearts. Blessed are the men and women who have found that perfect mutual heart rest. Provided that economic stress is not too hard, their lives are constantly irradiated by the soft glow of that unquenchable sacred fire. The storms of the world pass them by. Their only sadness is that so many others have not found what they have found. But as their own perfect love gives them a wider understanding of the world's need, so they look with wider vision on the married inharmony outside their charmed circle. They realize that as ignorance and selfishness are gradually overcome, and as men and women learn that only by *giving* out love can they ever truly *receive* love, thus will other men and women come at last into their divine heritage, and those hearts also will then be at rest.

In conclusion I leave with you what seems to me the highest thought which bears on the love of Man and Woman. That thought I find in Tagore's *The Infinite Love*, a great poet's conception of a love that grows and gathers power, life after life, Age after Age, whose source is in the Cosmic Consciousness Itself, "before beginning and without an end."

## THE INFINITE LOVE

### TAGORE

I have ever loved thee in a hundred forms and times,
Age after age, in birth following birth.
The chain of songs that my fond heart did weave
Thou graciously did take around thy neck,
Age after age, in birth following birth.

When I listen to the tales of the primitive past,
The love-pangs of the far distant times,
The meetings and the partings of the ancient ages—
I see thy form gathering light
Through the dark dimness of Eternity
And appearing as a star ever fixed in the memory of all.

We two have come floating by the twin-currents of love—
That well up from the inmost heart of the Beginningless.
We two have played in the lives of myriad lovers,
In tearful solitude of sorrow,
In tremulous shyness of sweet union,
In old, old love ever renewing its life.

The on-rolling flood of the love eternal
Hath at last found its perfect final course.
All the joys and sorrows and longings of heart,
All the memories of ecstasy,
All the love-lyrics of poets of all climes and times
Have come from the everywhere
And gathered in one single love at thy feet.

3477-3

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
0 019 566 953 3